Theological Magazine

OF THE

EVANGELICAL SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA

VOLUME 59 MAY 1931 NUMBER 3

Μίμηται 1. Cor. 4, 16 sq.
Βίβλος ἀρχὴ ἐστὶν, ἐφὸς ἐν Χριστῷ.

Published bi-monthly and entered at the post office at Saint Louis, Missouri, as second-class matter in December, 1922. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October, 1917, authorized on July 6, 1918.

Contents

Page

.....161

.....174

.....184

.....188

.....196

.....204

.....208

.....225

Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per year (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 1956 W. Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-24 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

VOL. 59 ST LOUIS, MO. MAY 1.

THE TASK OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS AMONG THE LOW-CASTE GROUPS OF HINDUS

Rev. H. E. Koenig

Part I—The Chamars—A Low-Caste Group

INTRODUCTION

"Greift nur hinein ins volle Menschenleben, und wo ihr's packt, da ist es interessant." From among the teeming millions of "Mother India's" children, the writer selected a closely defined group as an object for intensive study. Sir William Hunter describes the members of this caste, the Chamars, as being "always on the verge of starvation; their lean, black and ill-formed figures, their stupid faces, and their filthy habits reflect the long degradation to which they have been hereditarily subjected."[1] Interessant! Not only that, but I trust that the result of this study may also prove profitable to all who take time to read this paper.

This thesis represents an attempt to throw light upon conditions prevailing among low-caste groups of India, and to set forth the problems which the endeavor to win them for Christ brings to Christian missionaries. In the second half, which I entitled, "The Task," plans and suggestions for more effective, and therefore more fruiful, work will be offered.

In view of the fact that I have no first-hand knowledge of conditions, but had to rely upon information gathered from many, often fugitive, sources, this self-imposed task may appear as a somewhat presumptuous and altogether futile undertaking. And yet,

[1] Hasting's Bible Dictionary, Article on the Chamars.

lack of direct contact brings with it one decided advantage which mission workers who are actively engaged in the work on the field cannot have, it insures greater objectivity in the approach to and in the treatment of the subject. A paper of this type, based altogether upon the observations of others, should also demonstrate that the home-church can enter into an appreciative and intelligent understanding of foreign mission work. Moreover, since I was privileged to prepare this paper with the help and advice of an expert on missions, (The Rev. Henry B. Robins, Ph.D., professor at the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School) this contribution to mission literature should not be wholly void of value, especially in so far as the workers in the home church may see fit to give attention to it.

India's Ethnographic Puzzle

Before attempting the present intensive study of India and its people, I was often at a loss to account for the fact that so many statements made by missionaries relative to Hinduism were so completely at variance with each other. Soon, however, I discovered, that the reason for these divergent accounts can readily be traced to the ambiguity of the inclusive term "Hinduism."

"Hinduism includes a complex congeries of creeds and doctrines. It shelters within its portals monotheists and pantheists; worshippers of the great gods Siva and Vishnu or of their female counterparts, as well as worshippers of trees, rocks and streams, and of the tutelary village deities; persons who propitiate their deities by all manner of bloody sacrifices, and persons who will not only kill no living creatures but who must not even use the word 'cut'; those whose ritual consists mainly of prayers and hymns, and those who indulge in unspeakable orgies in the name of religion; and a host of more or less heterodox sectaries."[2]

In other words, the term "Hinduism" is misleading if used to designate a distinct type of religion; on the other hand, it does serve fairly well as a *socio-political* classification, since it treats as a whole the people who recognize *caste,* and who are governed by one form or other of Hindu law.

As a people, the Hindus include practically as many different racial strains as the term "Hinduism" denotes different types of religious convictions and practices. From Risley's "The People of India," (a classic in the field of anthropology) we learn that the following factors have caused India's racial complex to become what it is today.

"In respect of those decisive physical features which determine the course of the national movements of mankind, India may be

[2] 1911 Census of India, par. 152.

described as an irregular or pearshaped fortress, protected on two sides by the sea, and guarded on the third by the great bulwark of mountain ranges of which the Himalaya forms the central and most impregnable portion. As these ranges curve westward and southward toward the Arabian Sea, they are pierced by a number of passes practical enough for the march of unopposed armies, but offering little encouragement to the halting advance of family or tribal migration. On the East, though the conformation is different, its secluding influence is equally strong. Conditions along the coastline tended equally to preclude immigration on a large scale."[3]

This section of the world, thus isolated by natural barriers, comprises three main regions, each possessing an ethic character of its own. The Deccan, itself one of the oldest geological formations, consisting of the southern table-land with its irregular hill ranges rising out of undulating plains has since the dawn of history been the home of the Dravidians, the oldest of the Indian races. Two main theories relative the origin of the Dravidians occupy the field today; one, that they are allied to the Oceanic Negritos, among whom are included the aborigines of Australia and Tasmania; the other, that they entered India in prehistoric times from the north or west. In the isolated hill ranges and lofty plateau of the Deccan, guarded by fever haunted forests and offering no prospect of profit or plunder, aboriginal tribes, or such who emigrated en masse, could find an abiding refuge.

The long fertile plains of the Middle Land, traversed by navigable rivers and lying open to the march of armies, lent themselves to that "crushing out" process of radical distinctions which conquest brought in its train. Mongoloid hordes passed down the valleys of the rivers—the Brahmaputra, the Chindwin and the Irawaddy—and drove their predecessors, who seem to have been Dravidians, into the mountain fastnesses overlooking the valleys, and finally overwhelmed and absorbed them.

As noted above, the Himalayas opposed an effective obstacle to the fusion of contrasting types, because they form an unbroken chain of snow-clad peaks, and of passes which are practicable only at certain seasons. Nevertheless, from time to time armies of white men, socalled "Aryans," penetrated through these passes finding the passage, however, so difficult, that it is believed that they usually left their women behind them. All that is really known of this "Aryan" race is that they came into India from the north or west. When literary evidence begins—the Vedic hymns—we find them settled in the "Holy Land" of the Hindus, the southwestern Punjab.

---

[3] Risley, The People of India, p. 3.

These three strains, the white, the yellow and the black have now become so intermingled and confounded that it is impossible to say where one variety of man ends and another begins. And yet, even as the basic colors of the rainbow are clearly distinguishable, although they shade into each other by imperceptible gradations, so scholars (primarily Risley and Crooke) have found it possible to point out seven distinct race-groups among the Hindus, which have evolved from the three basic strains. They are: 1) The Turko-Iranian type, represented by the Baloch, Afghans, etc, in the north-west frontier, probably formed by a fusion of Turkish and Persian elements. Their complexion is fair, eyes mostly dark, hair on face plentiful. 2) The Indo-Aryan type, occupying the Punjab, Rajputana and Kashmir. This type approaches most closely to that ascribed to the traditional Aryan colonists of India; their stature is tall, complexion fair, eyes dark. 3) The Scytho-Dravidian type of Western India. 4) The Mongoloid type of the Himalayas, Nepal, etc. 5) The Mongolo-Dravidian type of lower Bengal and Orissa. 6) The Dravidian type, extending from Ceylon to the valleys of the Ganges. 7) The Aryo-Dravidian type, found in the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, in part of Rajputana, the Central Provinces, etc. The complexion varies from lightish brown to black, the nose is always broader than among Indo-Aryans, stature is rather low. This last group includes the *Chamars*.

Risley places the Chamars at the lowest strata of the Aryo-Dravidian group, whose higher representatives approach the Indo-Aryan type, while the lower members are in many respects not far removed from the pure Dravidians. The type is essentially a mixed one; yet its characteristics are readily definable.

"No one would take even the upper class of Hindustani for a pure Indo-Aryan, or a Chamar for a pure Dravidian. . . . down at the bottom of the lower strata of Hindu society this type (the Aryo-Dravidian) is represented by the Chamar, who tans hides, and is credibly charged with poisoning cattle."[4]

Thus we see that the hereditary background of the Chamar includes, although in unequal proportion (Briggs writes that the caste is "predominantly non-Aryan"—Briggs, The Chamars, p. 19) at least two of the primary ethnic types of Hindus—the Aryan and the Dravidian. From this fact the uninitiated might infer that a study of the Chamar must inevitably reveal a rather cosmopolitan type of man. Nothing, however, could be farther from the truth, for

---

[4] Risley, The People of India, pp. 39, 40.

the uniquely divisive power of *caste*[5] has assigned to the Chamar his place within Hinduism, definitely fixing his social, cultural and economic status. The stigma adhering to his hereditary occupation, tanning, has caused the Hindu to place the Chamar beyond the pale of respectable Indian society; although himself observing the rules of caste most conscientiously, he is regarded by others as an outcaste, an untouchable.

Caste

Although peculiar to India in its severe and uncompromising rigidity, the phenomenon of caste is not at all restricted to its people. Caste is the foundation of nationalism; within European political entities it appears as the divisive principle, separating the nobility from the common man. Even in democratic America the forces which generate caste are incessantly at work. Overt instances of its activity may be seen in: the open assertion that the Anglo-Saxon element in America should dominate and control; the relationship of the white race to the colored; the wide, and for many unbridgeable, gulf separating the inordinately wealthy, as well as the social aristocracy, from the average citizen; the superiority complex of the average college graduate; the popularity of fraternal organizations, which is based on their exclusiveness; and, I dare say, in the spirit of aloofness assumed by some subdivisions of Christianity over against more democratic branches of this great religion.

The underlying motive of caste is the selfish desire of the powerful to exploit the weak. Caste seeks special privileges for one group at the expense of another. Having once achieved its objective, any successful group will seek to perpetuate its advantage; it therefore segregates itself from the less fortunate members of society, seeking constantly to accentuate the lines of demarcation. Social equality is contemptuously denied. As soon as possible, the season of open conflict, which is always present in the early stages of caste formation, is terminated by the victors, since incessant strife would only tend to exhaust both contending parties, and thus deprive the strong of the advantages sought. Recourse is taken to more subtle, less destructive but equally effective measures which help in conserving advantages, once they have been gained. Among these we find the stabilizing forces of custom and tradition, respect for the past, and, *the sanction of religion*—a most power-

[5] Undoubtedly caste is the greatest curse of Hinduism. It undermines and makes futile any ambition the low-caste man may have; it obliterates all hope for advancement. Even though there are powerful forces at work which tend to disintegrate caste, a careful observer will note that the principle of caste has become so deeply ingrained upon the soul of Hinduism that it will probably succeed in adapting itself to the new day.

ful ally. As this strategy proves effective, the vanquished and exploited masses will gradually accept their status as a misfortune which must be borne, since it cannot be altered; the low-caste Hindu bows to "karma".

The following causes are said to have been instrumental in the genesis of caste as found today in India: prejudice, common to Aryans and the various aboriginal tribes, against giving a daughter in marriage outside of tribal limits; also the attitude assumed by Aryans in refusing to eat with persons of lower social rank; the fact that some Aryan armies brought few women with them. The progeny issuing from the union of Aryan men with aboriginal women were assigned a lower social status than the pure Aryans. Probably these half-breeds again divided among themselves somewhat like the quadroons and octoroons of America. With the rise of Hinduism (after the Vedic period) social distinctions were further accentuated and complicated by distinctions based on ceremonial practices. Whereas in Vedic times every head of a family group served as its priest, Hinduism reserved this prerogative for selected individuals, the Brahmans. The next and crucial stage in the development of caste had its origin among the functional groups. They formed trade-guilds and then organized self under panchayats, or councils of headsmen. As these panchayats assumed ever more rigid control over the affairs of their respective groups, the line of cleavage, separating them from others, was increasingly accentuated. So powerful became the traditions and customs to be observed in each group, and so effective the control of the headmen, that the individual Hindu was deprived of all personal initiative or independence. The accident of birth definitely and permanently determined his status.

It must be admitted that today there are many factors which tend to undermine caste. These include: the influence of British civilization; introduction of modern machinery, as a result of which the old organizations, established largely upon a functional basis, prove unsuited to modern conditions; the impossibility of a high-caste man to preserve, while travelling, the aloofness maintained in his native village; the waning authority of the Brahmans; the changing status of child widows; the dissemination of Western ideas of equality; the appointment to office by the British government on the basis of merit rather than social standing. Informed and capable observers, however, assert that in spite of changing conditions the principle of caste is at work as effectively as ever, and they say that it will succeed in establishing a new adjustment within society, with caste continuing to be the all powerful factor in determining the destinies of individual Hindus.

The Chamars

The uninitiated will profit but little from the above general statements unless concrete examples accentuate, and thus fix permanently and clearly in his mind, what otherwise would soon be forgotten for lack of vivid imagery accompanying the presentation. For this reason I thought it necessary to include a more detailed study of a particular caste-group in this paper: concentrating my attention upon the Chamars, because they represent that group which is most prominently represented among the castes to be found in our denominational mission field in Central India.

The Chamars owe their origin as a distinct social entity to the segregating and unifying tendencies of a common occupation. The basal group was of aboriginal origin, a fact which Risley's scientific investigations definitely disclosed. The recruitments from above and below, however, must have been large, for, as constituted today, the caste is made of heterogeneous groups. It has been noted, for example, that many Chamar women have fine features and that some of the men have a better cast of feature than is common at that social level. This may be explained in part as resulting from the illicit relations which which Chamar women have had with men of higher caste. Moreover, in certain instances whole clans, who were unable to maintain their higher social status, were embraced by the Chamars.

The basal group of the Chamars, however, has always been large enough to assimilate its recruits to its own standards of temper and character. In this caste there is a close, and historically complete, contact with Indian village life. The Chamar was grouped, however, with the lowly and outcasts, who were forced to live on the outskirts of the village, because his occupation, tanning, although indispensable and of great economic importance, was so repulsive, and, because the handling of carcasses brought him in physical contact with that which was strictly taboo.

And yet, although regarded as an outcast, the Chamars observe most faithfully all practices peculiar to caste-tradition. Possibly the most distinctive characteristics of caste exclusiveness are the rules concerning exogamy and endogamy. The Chamar, for example, usually chooses his wife locally, outside of his own village group, but within his own sub-caste. Even within endogamous groups occupation may in certain instances bar marriages; thus, for example, those who remove manure and night-soil cannot intermarry with those who serve as grooms. Chamars also observe caste-rules governing commensality most faithfully, and are said to conform to Hindu practices rather more strictly than better class Hindus. They will not accept food from Mohammedans.

The moral standards of this group are very low, in many instances so repulsive and degrading that one wonders how Christianity may ever be able to win people, so deeply submerged in immorality, to its own standards of sexual purity. The Chamars have no general objection to polygamy, provided a man is able to support more than one wife, which is not often the case. Early marriage is regarded as self-evident, the 1911 Census reports showing that 98% of all girls under 15 were married. A visitor occasionally has liberties with the host's wife or daughter, but, this is not considered "good". Some wives are hired out; women at times exchange husbands. In the Central Provinces Chamar women are at times hired out for the revolting sakti-marg ceremonies. In connection with certain festivities there is great sexual license; not only are the songs sung on these occasions obscene beyond imagination, but the people abandon themselves to unbridled excesses. Briggs informs us that the moral standards of the Chamar are not only low in respect to social purity, but also in matters of excessive use of narcotic drugs and intoxicants.

All customs and traditions which the Chamar must observe, to retain his membership within the caste in good standing, come under the supervision, direction and control of the panchayat, or council, whose function Briggs describes as follows:

"In its simplest form the panchayat consists of all men within the subcaste who reside in any given village. In its less extensive form it may be composed of old men, each family being represented. There may be a sub-committee, often composed of five persons, which guides and rules the larger body. The headman, whose office is usually hereditary, is elected for life."[6]

The panchayat is probably a development of the patriarchal system of government. It exercises jurisdiction over the following classes of cases: illicit sexual relations; violations of tribal rules of commensality; matrimonial disputes; petty quarrels, such as fights, etc.; small debt, where no appeal is made to the courts; cases connected with hereditary rights; matters affecting the welfare of the entire caste. The council usually imposes a fine as punishment. A more serious result of conviction may be the severance of all marriage alliances of the offender with his family.

Becoming a Christian does not necessarily result in excommunication, since the Hindu is but little interested in the religious beliefs of his fellows so long as they do not interfere with the proper observance of caste laws. A Chamar who has embraced the Mohammedan religion, however, is automatically and permanently excluded from his clan. In some regions, where the Christian is re-

[6] Briggs, The Chamars, p. 49.

garded as a social outcast, he may be reinstated by the payment of a fine. Whenever a whole village whose members have become Christians desires to be reinstated into the fellowship of the caste, an amount in keeping with the financial resources of group, is paid through the chaudhari (headman) to the chaudhari of that region. The work of the panchayat is of great importance. It relieves the courts of many petty cases, and is of great regulative value in the social affairs of the village group.

Tradition has reserved to the Chamar certain hereditary privileges which, of course, are jealously guarded. He is expected to remove dead cattle, to prepare leather from their hides, and to furnish a limited supply of shoes and leather articles in return for these privileges. The activities of this caste are, however, not at all restricted to the one trade. According to the Census Report of 1901, Chamars hold 21 different occupations. The most important among these, in addition to tanning, are agriculture and employment as servants. The Chamar is, in fact, a "jack of all trades." He serves as a grass cutter, coolie, wood and bundle carrier, drudge, maker and repairer of thatch and mud walls, field laborer, groom, house servant, brickmaker and village watchman.

Until quite recently the Chamar's position as farmer was one of practical serfdom. He was tied to the soil on which he was born and transferred with it to new ownership. Today his position has been greatly improved so that some Chamars have actually advanced to the status of landowners; and in the Central Provinces, whole villages are possessed by them. And yet the majority of them are helplessly under the heels of landlords from whom they must borrow money to purchase seed-grain, leather, oxen, etc. Debt becomes a heavy shackle, so that in many instances the labor of the whole family is required to satisfy the claims of the creditors.

There are also hopeful signs; for, as these people begin to discover their rights before the law, and as they gather courage, their position will and must improve. Still, Briggs concludes: "the process which will lift the Chamar from dependence to independence is a long one, and as yet he has hardly begun to move."

In turning to the study of the Chamar's religion, we shall note a situation closely analogous to his social status. We shall learn that his religious views are predominantly animistic, a fact which can readily be understood as one recalls that the basal stock of the caste was largely recruited from the aboriginal population of India. The Chamar believes that inanimate objects, such as stones, plants and trees, as well as animals, and even human beings, are the abode of spirits. The activities of these mysterious, animating powers (the result of whose influence can everywhere be observed in na-

ture) explain to the Chamar the phenomena of reality. Moreover, in common with all animists, these people believe that the caprice of the inhabitants of the spirit world determines the fate of man. This mysterious company of invisible powers is responsible for all calamity, for fever, cholera, small-pox, and all other hardships of life.

Although he believes that in seeking to cope with the spirit world the odds are greatly against him, the Chamar nevertheless does the best he can under the circumstances by seeking to ingeniously outwit his enemies through his cunning, or, if that fail, by endeavoring to conciliate them through worship and sacrifice. In order to heighten his chances for success, as he seeks to adjust himself to the evil powers, the Chamar also enlists the help of the tutelary godlings, the sainted dead and other well-disposed spirits; or, he takes recourse to the powers of magic. This is usually practised by professionals, men who have been initiated into the mysteries of the occult, or who find themselves endowed with unusual powers of control over the spiritworld.

An instance of sympathetic magic is to be found in the belief that the afterbirth of a cat rubbed on the eyes enables one to see in the dark. The owl is a foreboder of evil; still, it is dangerous to drive it away by throwing clods at it, for it may pick up the clod and rub it to powder, in which case the offender will decline and finally die. This is another case of sympathetic magic.

Above all the Chamar seeks to ward off the harm which may come to him through the evil influence of the malevolent dead. The spirit of a person who has died a violent death by accident, suicide or capital punishment, or the spirit of one whose funeral rites have been neglected, is called a "Bhut". These are very dangerous and need to be propitiated. The Churl, the spirit of an unfortunate woman is also greatly feared. She is described as having pendent breasts, large projecting teeth, thick lips, unkempt hair, a black tongue; her feet, like those of most evil spirits, are turned around; some say she is black behind and white in front. To lay the ghost of a women of whom it is feared that she may return asa Churl, the body is buried face downwards, and some fill the grave with heavy stones and thorns to keep down the ghost.

As he endeavors to make the best of his ghost-infested existence, the Chamar employs prudence based on common sense. Spirits enter the body through the head, the mouth, the ear, hands or feet; so the feet are washed at weddings—an occasion when the inhabitants of the spirit world are exceptionally active, and more than ordinarily dangerous. In fact, at all great crises in life, birth, marriage, and death, persons are most subject to demoniacal pos-

session. The elaborate ceremonies observed at such times have for their object the scaring away of demons. Moreover, one is never safe against evil spirits. Opportune moments, for example, for demons to enter the body rise when one yawns; so the wary Chamar claps his hands over his mouth on such occasions, snaps his fingers and calls out "Nayaran."

The modern man may feel inclined to turn with disgust from such utterly absurd nonsense; and yet, this futile and degrading religion is not quite so tragic in its implications as the conclusions at which some of the most prominent representatives of modern science have arrived. One of these has voiced his conviction that the greatest tragedy in the universe is to be found in the fact that an unreasoning cosmos has produced a being (in the development of the evolutionary process) which is self-conscious, and therefore aware of his own impotence. In contrast to such hopeless and heartless materialism, the animist at least recognizes a principle of life, pervading reality. It is true, that he is largely afraid of this animating principle and its implications, yet his religion is not altogether void of hope. The confusion and absurdity of his ideas, observations and his religious attitude arise from his inability to discriminate and to generalize. He does not know the one, true God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Nevertheless, in seeking to adjust himself to a mysterious reality, his philosophy is appreciably farther removed from error than that of the crass materialists of today, who seek to dominate Western civilization.

It was inevitable that the religious concepts of animists should be influenced and modified by the higher religions of the people who conquered the more primitive aborigines of India. On the other hand, every student of religion knows that the carefree, happy, nature-religion of the Vedas, which the Aryan conquerors had brought with them to their new home, was also materially modified by its contact with animism. Today, the religion of high-caste Hindus is shot through with animistic beliefs; fear, superstition and dependence upon the powers of witchcraft and magic and practically co-extensive with Hinduism, only a few, small groups of highly educated Hindus being excepted from this rule.

To trace the degree and extent of interdependent influence in the history of animism and Hinduism, is impossible. Among the Chamars many religious beliefs and practices are found which represent a distinct advance over animistic tenets. It is clearly evident that these were copied and taken over from Hinduism.

One finds, for example, that the Chamars acknowledge several nature gods. The position these hold, however, is not what it was during early Vedic times. The sun is but a godling, or a deified

hero. Although the Chamar is not permitted to worship at his shrine, still, every morning, as he leaves his house, he bows to and calls upon the sun. The great gods of the Hindu pantheon are hardly known to the Chamar, although his beliefs are of polytheistic coloring. Still he has a belief, although vague of a better sort. The devout man, as Sir Alfred Lyall has put it: "trusts that there is something better and beyond and above the gods. And the Chamar worships, even though it be in a hazy fashion, this Supreme Being."

Chamars accept the doctrines of transmigration and karma, which accounts for their fatalistic outlook upon life. Certain sects of this caste do teach, however, that guru worship will issue in a permanent release from the otherwise endless round of births. Although denied admission to most Hindu temples, there are many other shrines in which the Chamar has faith and at which he may worship. One can frequently observe him worshipping at the primitive local shrines. The offerings before godlings consist of lamps, cakes, milk, goats, pigs, fowls, and, occasionally, a buffalo. Worship is rather intermittent and often entirely neglected until some calamity overtakes the people.

The gurus are an important type of religious leader. These men travel over the country expounding doctrines of religion and initiating candidates into their specific sects. They exert a comparatively wholesome influence upon the community. The more learned mahants have some knowledge of Tulsi Das' "Ramayan," and of the "Bhagavad Gita," the "New Testament" of Hindu literature. The great guru Nanak founded the Sikh movement; he has made his influence profoundly felt among the Chamars. And the poet Kabir, also indebted to Nanak, has wielded an even greater influence. His attitude toward caste, which he opposed, won for him a great following from among the lower strata of society. The Satnamis, one of the largest and most influential subcastes of the Chamars, trace their existence as a distinct group to the work of Kabir. It is said that Kabir's best hymns are probably the loftiest works written in Hindustani.

Unfortunately, however, practise is hardly ever consonant with theory. If one is to gain a correct insight into the religious life of these more idealistic groups of Chamars, he must also take into account such observations as were made by Professor Lohans, who writes:

"Ghasidas (the Satnami who carried this religion into the Central Provinces) taught: there is but one, invisible God, creator of the universe. Idolatry is sinful. All men are brethren. The distinctions made on account of race, color and caste are all wrong.

God's name has not been revealed. Men should therefore not apply any name to Him, but worship Him as Satya Nam—the true name. . . . It is astonishing that upon such a splendid foundation an ethical structure should have been erected that is fairly reeking with iniquity and vileness. Some of their practices and habits are so revolting that they are simply beyond description. Oppressed and abhorred by everybody, it is but small wonder that such inherent traits of Hindu character as deceitfulness, untruthfulness and sexual vice should be especially developed among the Chamars. Making generous allowance for all the good exceptions on the side of the Satnamis, it must still be admitted that as a class they rank lower in morals than any other section of the Hindu community."[7]

This quotation forcefully brings home this truth that even though individuals and small groups of seriously minded people may be doing excellent pioneer work in seeking to win their fellows for a better life, it is impossible for larger groups to advance very far beyond the standard of commonly accepted traditions and practices, as observed in their environment. In this fact I also find a powerful argument in favor of the contention that for generations and centuries to come it will be necessary for the Christian missionary to guide, supervise and inspire (not control) the development of an indigenous Christian church, if eventually the cause of Christ is to become truly victorious in India. A study of this "Task" will be offered in the second half of this paper.

[7] Lohans, Evangelical Mission Work in Chhattisgarh, p. 23.

ETHICS OF MONISTIC AND DUALISTIC RELIGIONS

By Elmer S. F. Arndt

"The peculiar position of religion," Whitehead points out, "is that it stands between abstract metaphysics and the particular principles applying to only some among the experiences of life."[1] This position is not an altogether stable one and is always in immediate danger of dislocation. What direction the pendulum will take, i.e., whether the particular religion will center its interest on the metaphysical or on the ethical problem, is determined to a large extent by the culture-pattern of a people, if culture-pattern be taken in a broad sense, including not only the intellectual heritage, but the environmental factors as well. The history of religions is the exemplification of the attempt to combine into one coherent whole what Baron von Huegel calls the *Isness* of religion with its *Oughtness.*

The solutions to this problem have been various. On the one hand there is the cosmological dualism of Chinese state religion without a moral dualism; the ethical dualism of Zoroastrianism with concomitant natural effects dramatically conceived; the ethical dualism of Hebraic religion with a dramatically conceived natural world completely controlled by the ethical ideal; and the Christian tradition atempting to maintain a sharp ethical dualism together with the complete dependence of the world on God. On the other hand there is the cosmological monism of Lao-Tze, the Stoics, and Spinoza with the resultant subordination of Oughtness to Isness; the metaphysical system of Buddhism with the quest for the infinite and the rejection of the finite.

The variety of solutions, despite significant variations, may be classified under two heads: solutions whose primary emphasis is on the moral life, conceived as the conflict between the actual and the ideal, and solutions whose primary emphasis is on the rational life, conceived as the search for unity in the diversity of existence and for stability in its flux. The first classification may be conveniently termed the dualistic and the second the monistic. The characteristic of the first is preoccupation with the ethical problem and that of the second preoccupation with the cosmological problem.

The choice of the material for religious reflection is conditioned by the aspect of life which occupies the highest place in the hierarchy of values. There is, of course, mutual interaction between the choice of the material, whether it be nature or history,

[1] *Religion in the Making,* p. 31.

and the dominating interest. Where the contemplative interest is strongest (and by contemplative I mean the intellectual and the aesthetic, for while intellectual or rational and aesthetic have significant distinguishing marks, they are at one in that both are contemplative seeking a harmony in diversity) the material of reflection is usually nature, as in Taoism, Buddhism, and Stoicism. Where the emphasis is on conduct, the field of reflection is history, as in Hebraism, Zoroastrianism, Confucianism, and Christianity. History, however, may take either a monistic or a dualistic form. The form reflection on history takes depends on a presupposition: The idea of progress. If the interpretation of history is undertaken in the spirit of unqualified optimism, then its interpretation becomes monistic. This interpretation finds its clearest exemplification and consummation in the Hegelian metaphysics which is a bold interpretation of nature in the light of an optimistic interpretation of history. Where the interpretation is approached with a seriously qualified optimism, i.e., with an optimism qualified by a pessimism with respect to the contemporary situation, the interpretation will be dualistic, as in the Hebraic tradition. In popular terms, when the "Golden Age is conceived of as a preceding era, the interpretation of history will be dualistic; when conceived of as future, the interpretation will be monistic. Christianity maintains a balance between optimism and pessimism, holding both elements in solution, since it has two golden ages: the past state of man's innocence and the future Kingdom of God. Thus, our lines do not hold absolutely, but they are clearly enough drawn to afford some help in understanding our problem.

A third factor which conditions the predominant interest in the life of a people is the socio-economic factor. I use socio-economic in the widest sense, including environmental and racial influences as well as those usually designated by the term. It seems that young and vigorous races are more inclined to a dualistic religion, whereas old and settled races tend to monistic religions. Thus, the religions of the Iranian and Hebrew peoples were dualistic; both races were engaged in the conquest of an environment and a defense of cultural heritage and material possessions from hostile influences. Buddhism, Taoism, and Stoicism are the religions of an old culture, a stabilized life, and an organized society.

There is one factor which seriously qualifies what we shall have to say about the ethics of the two types of religion with which we shall deal. That factor is vitality; it seriously qualifies what might be otherwise the natural result of the kind of religious world-view that is espoused. Vitality is not a virtue of logic; indeed it condemns logic. A vigorous religion is often able to overcome and

transcend the logic of its dogmas and the ethical hazards implicit in its world-view. The transcendence of logic is nowhere more evident than in Calvinism which taught a strict doctrine of election and yet maintained a rigorous ethic and an activistic attitude of great power. It was only when the vigor of the early period was past that the doctrine of election became an enervating influence and a narcotic in place of a stimulant to the religious and ethical life.

II

Dualistic religions are positivistic, concerned with fact rather than explanation. Rationality is not their prime concern. They are religious in quest of a metaphysics rather than a metaphysics in quest of a religion. So far as they have a metaphysics it is a dramatic cosmology, a cosmic enactment of human life in its ethical struggles.

George Santayana[2] has traced with discriminating insight the development of myth, exemplifying the ascendency of the ethical over the metaphysical problem. Myth, he tells us, is a pre-scientific attempt to explain natural phenomena, a poetic explanation of observed phenomena. But the passion for fact, the development of which would result in science, gives way to interest in the myth itself. This is a shift from the metaphysical to the ethical interest, for in the process the nature god is endowed with moral attributes. The sun-god Apollo becomes the god of light, of medicine, of music. Zeus, the thunder-god, becomes the god of justice and the protector of the stranger.

We have an analogous process in Hebraic religion. The Kenite nature-god becomes the ethical god of Moses, the god of love in Hosea. So far as he has metaphysical attributes such as omnipotence and omniscience, he has them because they are demanded by his ethical character. The process is exemplified in Zoroastrian religion which took over the ancient Aryan nature deities and invested them with ethical attributes.

Dualistic religions have to some extent at least been religions of world-affirmation. The worlds of nature and of history have remained worlds of fact, and not become worlds of illusion, even when the world of salvation was separated from nature and history as in Christian theology. Hebraic religion did not think of salvation as confined to or localized in a transcendent world. Rewards and punishments were administered on earth. This was true until post-exilic times. Zoroastrianism made conduct in this life and the concrete world of fact the criterion of one's status in the

[2] *In his Reason in Religion*, especially ch. IV.

next. Christianity has taught that this world is in some sense a "Vale of Soul-Making" as Keats phrased it.

The ethical consequence of this characteristic has been to direct attention to this world and given a cosmic significance to the conduct of men. This consequence reached a sublime form in the Hebraic teaching that the evil in the world was due to the sin of man. "What the true religion," Professor Moore writes of Zoroastrianism, "demands of men is that they should decide for Ahura-Mazda, choosing the way of truth and goodness. Man must give himself to Asha, Vohu Mano, and Ahura-Mazda; he must follow the Lord, be like him, and teach others to be like him; and he must labor for the renewal of the world."[3]

Zoroastrianism has much magic left in it. Killing sacred animals is as great a crime (and greater) than killing a man. Like Hebraism, it was limited in its social sympathies to the chosen race. But the kernel of development was there just as it was in prophetic Hebraism. The social relationships were reaffirmed, purified, and given the sanction of religion. And it is important to note that justice, purity, truth, and mercy to the unfortunate were enjoined, not in order to attain peace for the individual soul (which was consequence rather than motivation), but because these relationships had value in themselves.

Dualistic religions (Christianity in some theological formulations is a notable exception) are not deterministic. The actual and the ideal are always conceived of as numerically two, the relation being one of dependence of the actual on the ideal. "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof." "The whole earth is his glory." But God is transcendent to the world of nature. The relation (in technical terms) as regards direction is a symmetrical. The world is originally related to God but it is not necessary to him. The world, for both Zoroaster and the Old Testament prophets, is to be renewed. The transcendent God in contrast with the world of history heightens the tension between what is and ought to be. Thus, indeterminism, by emphasizing, often naively enough, the ethically good qualities of God, makes evil and sin elements in the world that are to be overcome rather than endured. The way is open for a more intelligent insight and struggle with evil forces. Paul could write, "The things that I would do I do not, and the things which I would not do those things I do." And again, "I press on, not as one who has attained. . . ." The actual is, in other words, not the criterion of what ought to be; it is the refractory material which must be molded into the form of the ideal.

The dualistic religions do not, however, strain the tension to the breaking point. In that case, the result would be pessimism.

[3] G. F. Moore, *History of Religions*, Vol. I, p. 364.

No matter how dreadful the conflict, the good will finally win. Ahura-Mazda will finally conquer Ahriman; the devil will finally be restrained from his activity and punished. There is always the element of optimism, although seriously qualified. Indeed, if Schweitzer is right, optimism is essential for the ethical life. Further, dualistic religions give man a part in the consummation of the reign of the good, in so far as his activity may hasten or delay it. Thus a motivation is supplied for ethical activity beyond that which the immediate situation can supply.

While the spiritual development of dualistic religions has meant an increasing emphasis on motivation of action and an insistence on the importance of rightness of motive, nevertheless the positivism and indeterminism in them have laid the emphasis on the extrospective rather than the introspective life. The world was neither illusion nor standard; the religious life was not one which sought to annihilate personality or conform it to the impersonal, but to redirect it in its social relationships. All through Zoroastrianism and Hebraism and certain Christian groups such as the early Franciscans and the Quakers the emphasis is on the relation of man to his neighbor. "Now what doth the Lord thy God require of thee but to do justice and love mercy and walk humbly with thy God?" This subordination of the introspective to the extrospective is clearly evident in Paul's confession quoted above in which the introspective technique serves the extrospective life.

III

With the entrance of Christianity into the world of Greek culture and neo-platonic philosophy, the inadequacy of the Hebrew cosmogonic myth was realized. A reflective people could not endure a religion without cosmology, for rational religion must look both forwards and backwards. Patristic theology, which came to a climax in Augustine, bears witness to the attempt to discover a metaphysical setting for the religion. The attempt to escape a Manichean dualism on one hand and a pantheistic monism (to which Hebraism is very prone when interpreted philosophically) resulted in a nice balance which is ever losing its poise and regaining it with difficulty. Because of its character, Augustinian theology provides both a conclusion to the treatment of dualistic religion and an introduction to the ethics of monistic religions.

Augustine found himself confronted with the ambiguous elements of the Christian tradition. God was both the creator of the world and its redeemer; the creator of the soul, originally good, and yet now in need of a salvation which God alone could effect. To the clarification of and reconstruction of this ambiguous posi-

tion he brought a genuine religious fervor and platonic philosophy in the modified form of neo-platonism.

God, for Augustine, was the ideal eternal object of human thought and love. He is the eternal and the good and the beautiful and the true. Not true, but the truth; not good, but the good; not beautiful, but the beautiful. Thus all virtue, all grace, all love was a manifestation of God. God was thus the harmony of inward values. Augustine, being first religious and only secondarily philosophical, looked for God in the highest in life, not in the lowest. But this same God who is the ideal of human aspiration is also the creator of the world. Having made God substance, all definite being became congruous with the true and the good, since its constitution is intelligible and its operation is creative of values. Matter thus was the limiting principle; in the conceptual realm all was good.

Now, if God the good created the world, it must be good. But the fact of evil and sin is everywhere. Death and conflict surround us. Original sin both explained the evil and made the doctrine of creation possible. Then, however, the question arose of the origin of sin. Augustine found sin its own cause. In order to overcome the difficulty inherent in the dual conception of God the ideal of human life and God the forces of nature it was necessary to obscure the moral qualities of God. God is just, but his justice is neither what human justice actually is or what it should be ideally. God thus become a physical power became the God of arbitrary grace and arbitrary predestination. This part of Augustinianism is naturalistic monism pure and undefiled. God is the source of the evil as well as the good, for both worked together for the glory of God.

This brief and inadequate sketch throws into full relief the delicate balance of Christian theology and the ethical results of dualism and monism. Happily, Augustine was inconsistent enough not to act on his cosmological theory. If he had, he would have landed in Schopenhauerian pessimism. The first part of his theology was his practical creed; and it both sanctioned and purified the highest values and helped in their creation.

IV

The monistic religions all find their basis and criterion in nature. For if God and the world are one it is what ought to be. Monistic religions are not religions of salvation, but religions of adjustment. Buddhism, to be sure, is a religion of salvation, but because the monism is essentially evil; what one attains to is not freedom from the tension of life but freedom from the desire for life. It is the exemplification of monistic thought which is

pessimistic rather than optimistic, as it is in Lao-Tze, Spinoza, and Stoicism.

In Lao-Tze one discovers in clear terms the interest in nature. It was his never failing *magister*.

"Attain vacuity's completion and guard tranquility's fulness.

"All the ten thousand things arise, and I see them return. Now they bloom in bloom, but each one homeward returneth to its root.

"Returning to the root means rest. It signifies the return according to destiny. Return according to destiny means the eternal. Knowing the eternal means enlightenment. Not knowing the eternal causes the passions to rise and that is evil"[4]

"Man's standard is the Earth. The earth's standard is Heaven. Heaven's standard is Reason. Reason's standard is intrinsic."[5]

Likewise Spinoza found it necessary to preface his ethics with a philosophy of nature. And the results bear a striking resemblance to those of the Chinese sage.

Observation about nature and philosophizing about it, i.e., seeking the principle of unity in its flux, leads to determinism, for what is must be if nature itself is the standard. When determinism is married to optimism we have an ethics of resignation; when determinism is mated to pessimism we have an ethics of escape. In the first case the ethics is an ethics of enlightened egoism; in the second the ethics is a destruction of the ego itself.

The ethics of enlightened egoism finds expression in Lao-Tze, the Etoics and Spinoza. The great problem is to attain peace and stability in the world of flux. The emotions in man are the enemy of that unity and stability and conformity that is found in nature. Hence, the supreme ethical task is to subordinate the emotions. Like a theme in a fugue, this principle recurs ever and again in Lao-Tze, the Stoics and Spinoza. This insight leads to a very high ethic; there is much in these writers that is very similar to the sermon on the mount. "The good I meet with goodness; the bad I also meet with goodness; for virtue is good throughout."[6] Natures play no favorites; so the wise man is to make no discrimination. People like Confucius, and they are the largest part of humanity, think this is stark nonsense. Equity is a reasonable principle; but this undiscriminating attitude seems strangely irrational.

As with the Stoics, all men and all nature are expressions of the Universal Reason (Lao-Tze's Tao, Spinoza's God, the only sub-

[4] *Tao Teh King*, 16. Tr. by Paul Carus.
[5] *Ibid.*, 25.
[6] *Ibid.*, 49.

stance of which everything is a mode); and since all is an expression of the one principle every individual thing has its place in the universal harmony. Thus all things, the seeming good and the seeming evil, must be treated as an expression of the Divine. In natures that are mystical, like Lao-Tze and Spinoza, the soul is filled with an *amor intellectualis dei.*

But while this ethic may attain to great heights and profound insights there always remains a fundamental difference in its motivation from that of the dualistic religions. The motivation in the monistic religions is the perfection of the individual soul. Social relations are accepted because they exist and man must live in them. To attempt to change them would only result in the loss of inward peace. The aim of the wise man is to be as undisturbed as possible. The wise man does not hate, not because there is the positive injunction that he should love his fellowman, but because hate disturbs the inner serenity of his life. He should not repent, for repentance arises from emotion. "Repentance is not a virtue or in other words, it does not arise from the reason, but he who repents of an action is twice as unhappy or as weak as he was before."[1] Happiness is knowing one's place in the universe and acting in accordance with the universe. It is self-contained and undisturbed unity.

Buddhism, in the dawn of the spirit's self-consciousness, sought release from the world of nature. The Indians saw evil arising from the lust for life. The way of escape was the elimination, not only of desire, but the active nature of man itself. In seeking to spiritualize life, it destroyed the social relationships, and in seeking freedom from the world of sense declared it to be illusion. The ethics become the ethics of passivity; no active attitude is to be cherished at all. Not even is one to love the end one seeks. The virtues are all negative both in motivation and content: humility, abstinence from taking life, etc. Those principles which seem to be positive injunctions such as universal benevolence are negative as they are positive, for the end of such action is the eradication of all desire. No matter how far the principle would be pressed in the Buddhistic scheme it would never issue in the demand for the reorganization of society. Benevolence can exist in a caste system without any recognition of the inconsistency of the system with benevolence. One who sought Nirvana would have no attention to give to the vexed problem of social relationships.

Ultimately both pessimistic and optimistic monisms lead to the same results for the ethical life. For if, as in optimistic monism, every desire is evil and self-assertion the greatest destructive

[1] Spinoza, *Ethics*, Part IV, Prop. LIV.

force, the relation of man to the universe becomes a wholly spiritual relation. If ethics is to be effective, then the relation of man to the universe must not only be spiritual; it must also be an active devotion to the world of sense. Concern with the problem of adjustment to the universe is so largely an internal problem depending, like mysticism, for success on the perfection of an introspective technique that social relationships are transcended, and, with their transcendence, ethical distinctions as well. "Superior virtue is unvirtue. Therefore it has virtue. Inferior virtue never loses sight of virtue. Therefore it has no virtue. Superior virtue is non-assertion and without pretension. Inferior virtue asserts and makes pretensions."[8]

Determinism (or monism) is capable of producing a universal ethic. But the difficulties it faces overbalance the universalism of its ethic. In destroying provincial distinctions it also destroys significant ethical distinctions. William James[9] has pointed out with singular lucidity the ethical difficulties of determinism. Determinism, in denying that anything could occur in evil's stead, virtually defines the universe as a place in which what ought to be is impossible. The universe, then, has an irremediable flaw. Thus, on the one hand, determinism leads to pessimism. But the determinism can be interpreted optimistically if we suppress the judgment of regret and refuse to apply ethical categories to the universe. This leads to subjectivism. Thus the one horn of the dilemma is pessimism and the other subjectivism.

An unqualified pessimism is enervating for the ethical life, drying up the springs of action at the root. Subjectivism (as James terms it) raises a problem that it can answer only in terms inimical to an activist ethic. When every ethical action is an expression of the relation of the individual to the universe, one is faced with the question of how the relation of the individual to the universe is capable of producing an effect upon the universe. Monism answers this question in terms of resignation: the ethical is present only in so far as resignation can be explained as ethical. This leads directly to an ethics of passivity, and finds its culmination in an intellectual (as distinguished from the more exotic types) mysticism.

When moral ideals are transferred or attributed to the god of pantheism (which is the logical result of the teaching of Lao-Tze, the Stoa, and Spinoza) the only virtue is fortitude. When nature is evil in a monism the only salvation is escape. Both views make social reorganization impossible. The sage is removed from

[8] Tao-Teh-King, 38.
[9] "The Dilemma of Determinism" in the *Will to Believe*.

the world of tensions; his wisdom is not the wisdom of the prophetic tradition. All values find their transvaluation in the world of nature, which, being impersonal, cannot have the same values as individuals who assume that personality is the supreme value. In the monistic world all humane and plastic ideals are shattered in the chill world of conformity and resignation. Indian philosophy arrives at a similar conclusion by a different route. Its pessimism breeds asceticism. And asceticism, like conformity to nature, means transvaluation of values.

V

The history of ethics reveals the general proposition that dualism leads to an activistic ethic and that monism leads to an ethic of resignation. Ethics find monism intolerable; philosophy finds dualism intolerable. Is the conclusion to be drawn (which Schweitzer does draw) that we must eschew the metaphysical problem and hold to dualism? Is Augustine's contradiction the inescapable result of an attempted synthesis of the ethical and cosmological problem? Perhaps, and yet to adopt dualism prematurely is to surrender what insights further reflection might reveal.

A dramatic cosmology is possible in age without scientific habits of thought. But I suspect that in a scientific age, dramatic cosmology loses its naivete, in which consists its strength, and results finally in a dualism not only of ethical terms but also of matter and spirit. And this dualism, denying the devotion to the world of sense which is necessary for the ethical life, cuts the root of activism and leads to a poetic contemplation in which the world of fancy supplants the world of ethical values as the realm of the spirit.

STEWARDSHIP AS A WORLD FACTOR

By H. Vieth

Ten years ago stewardship as we understand the term today was unknown. Yet the idea is as old as the New Testament. Nor can it be said that the idea was forgotten or overlooked. It might be said that the idea was at rest. There simply was nothing in the conditions confronting the Christian in the world during the intervening centuries that made the assertion of the idea of vital importance. What is that something which made the assertion of stewardship as Christ asserted it of vital importance in his and again in our day while it was dormant in the centuries in between? It is undoubtedly the unequal distribution of wealth, which while practically eliminating the middle class confronts a small clique of men of extreme wealth with the masses which are rapidly being impoverished and results in overwhelming culture in materialism. Every student knows that that condition existed in the days of the Caesars, and can anyone doubt that the picture is increasingly true as far as our day is concerned? In Christ's day stewardship served a twofold purpose: For the individual it presented a spiritual escape from the devitalizing influence of a materialism rooted in love of money on one side and a want of it on the other. (Rich young ruler.) For society it presented the prophetic vision of the way of salvation out of threatening economic and spiritual disaster.

Because a similar need revived it in our day, it can no longer be said that stewardship is unknown. Many books have been written on the subject; practically all denominations have departments for promoting it; and it is increasingly used as a sermon topic. Yet with all this it must still be stated that the true meaning and significance of stewardship is rarely recognized.

In a world which is increasingly ruled by money and money values, stewardship is welcomed as a method for tapping the resources of wealth for the purposes of the church. Rising standards of living and rising costs of necessities and of luxuries which daily turn into necessities face congregations as well as denominations with the need of raising unprecedented sums merely to keep going. The constantly increasing complexity of our social organism, which has its root in the use of the machine and its object in providing employment for those whom the machine has robbed of a job, makes this burden still heavier. The babel of sound which proceeds from the beast with many heads of desire and many horns of power that is the modern state, adds alike to the difficulty and the cost of the task of the church in our day. Because stewardship was biblical authority for getting the money for the rising cost of doing what had to be done, it was welcome. It does not do much good to regret

all this or to protest against it, for it is inevitable. It takes more power to preach against the babble of a market place than in a quiet forest glade, and such power costs money.

But it is dangerous to be satisfied that stewardship proves to be the spiritual impetus needed for the raising of much needed money. For the church is not an end in itself but merely the means to an end. It is not enough that it should continue to exist, its task is to save the world.

Nor is it enough that stewardship should offer a personal escape from the prepondering weight of materialism. For it surely is no longer considered a Christian ideal to save one's own soul and let the world be damned. Of course stewardship is a spiritual way out of the material considerations and preoccupations of our day, but again it is dangerous to be satisfied with that.

Still most Christians who think about stewardship at all are satisfied with these two points, that they find a personal spiritual satisfaction in its simpler practises and a spiritual source of economic power for their church in its general application, and so it seems rather necessary to speak about stewardship from a different angle. And not merely to speak of it but to preach it with prophetic power as the one way out of the impassé into which our society has drifted, as a road of salvation out of an impossible economic and social situation.

For there can be no doubt that mankind is facing a very grave situation indeed, though there is some disagreement as to the causes and a wide divergence of opinion as to possible remedies. As to the causes it is so trite to blame the war for all our ills, one is ashamed to even mention it. And indeed the war is one of the surface indications rather than a deep lying cause. It and the peace which concluded it have undoubtedly both accelerated and aggravated the process of decomposition of our cultural society; but the causes lie deeper and farther back in history. In regard to them history tells a quite definite and easily read tale. For no matter what the particular genius of any great culture may be, its decline is always traceable to two distinct causes, the destruction of the middle class and the elimination of the small independent farmer. In design the means by which these two things are brought about are also always similar: greed and coveteousness in the acquisition of wealth, extreme selfishness in its use and enjoyment, and a merciless and shortsighted use of its power. These again are only possible when spiritual values have either been destroyed or the agencies for their assertion have lost their vitality and power.

Trace this design in the decline of the Graeco-Roman culture, the only one whose history is fully within the realm of our knowl-

edge. Then see how closely the factors of our day resemble those of that far off day.

The middle class in ancient Rome was extinct, in our day it is rapidly vanishing, the soil of Italy and most of the older provinces was in the hands of a few men and there were no independent farmers, in our day tenant farming is increasing at an appalling pace. Wealth now as then is in the hands of the few; greed and covetousness rule among that class who are looked upon as leaders, now as then. The utter selfishness of the seekers after pleasure and the merciless use of conomic power is only too apparent now as then. It is indeed an almost complete parallel.

There is only one point of difference. Rome had no longer any religion while we as yet have one. To the church we must look for the assertion of those spiritual values and ideals which alone can save the situation. Since greed and covetousness have given to the evils of our day a strictly economic form, the spiritual values to be asserted must have a bearing on the economic situation, and offer at least the hope of a way out of our economic impassé.

Now stewardship does present spiritual values with a definite bearing on our economic situation and spiritual ideals which hold out the hope of freedom from economic pressure. Other remedies are being offered but there is no other agency which seeks and offers a way out by going to the roots of our culture in spiritual values. That is why stewardship is today a world factor of tremendous importance.

Political leaders of the right are frantically trying to save the situation by bolstering up the economic structure with remedial legislation and by preaching the senseless optimism of the ostrich, that by closing your eyes to the evils of the day you can make everything come right in this best of all possible worlds.

Political leaders of the left—the extreme left—are ruthlessly trying to destroy the entire economic order and put in its place a new and untried order differing from the old only in the slight detail of the control of economic power.

Both are equally blind to the truth that no economic structure can stand unless it is rooted in spiritual values and controlled by spiritual ideals.

In stewardship the church has spiritual values which might lead to the use of our economic structure in righteousness instead of in selfishness; and spiritual ideal which might lure men away from the worship of economic idols. But as yet the church is content to use stewardship merely as a selfish tool to gain economic advantage. It is too much concerned with chasing its own little private devil alcohol, and remedying economic evils with the eco-

nomic measure of prohibition. It might even be accused of trying to prove the truth of Lenin's saying, that Religion is the opium of the people by preaching a sort of soporific religion of meek satisfaction with things as they are.

Will the church awake to its opportunity in time and will it have the prophetic zeal and the apostolic fervor to reassert the spiritual values and ideals regarding the economic order which are comprehended under the name of stewardship, for the salvation of the remnant of our culture? If our culture goes, our religion will have to find new forms, and that process means judgment.

There are certain hopeful signs which indicate that the church will not miss its great opportunity. There is the increasing occupation with the great spiritual truths needed for our day and serious attempts to make these truths intelligible for the people of our day. Rauschenbusch led the way and he has many followers. There is the growing interest in stewardship and there is a universal seeking of a new evangelistic fervor. These are hopeful signs. But the church needs greater consciousness of its essential unity and of its prophetic task. Its leaders on the left are too much preoccupied with purely intellectual problems and those on the right with ancient prejudices and animosities. These we must forget and learn to distill from the message of Jesus the healing salve for the ills of our day. If we fail—it may be that God must lead us through judgment to a newer and better day.

Krishnamurti.

Von Professor Dr. R. H. Grützmacher.

I.

Die Persönlichkeit Krishnamurtis.

Zwei Jahrzehnte sind vergangen, seit sich 1910 in Indien ein merkwürdiger Vorgang vollzog. Eine dreiundsechzigjährige Frau adoptierte einen dreizehnjährigen Jüngling in der Erwartung, daß ein alter und doch wieder neuer Weltenlehrer in ihm erscheinen werde. Die Frau war Annie Besant, der Jüngling Krishnamurti. Das Leben dieser Engländerin hat lange unter dem Gesetz der Wandlung gestanden. Sie war Christin, Zweiflerin, Atheistin, Sozialistin gewesen. Endlich fand sie Glück und Ziel ihres Daseins im Anschluß und in der Führung der theosophischen Gesellschaft in Indien. Nach ihrer Anschauung bedarf der Mensch auf dem Weg zur Vollkommenheit autoritativer Führung durch höhere Geister und Meister. Diese lebten nicht nur in der Vergangenheit, sondern treten in gewandelter Gestalt von neuem aus ihrer Verborgenheit hervor. Für indisch-theosophisches Denken bedeutete darum die Wiedergeburt eines alten Meisters keine solche Ueberraschung, wie für die abendländische Gebundenheit an geschichtliche Einmaligkeit und Unwiederholbarkeit. Annie Besants Blick — geschärft durch die Intuition führender Männer der Theosophie, wie des Obersten Olcott und des Bischofs Leadbeater — war auf den 1897 zu Madanapalle im östlichen Indien geborenen Sohn eines Inders Narainha gefallen. Beide Eltern entstammten dem alten priesterlichen Adel und hatten Blut und Geist ihrer Kaste dem Sohn rein vererbt. Sein Name wurde Jiddhu **Krishnamurti**. Er erinnerte an eine der großen Helden- und Göttergestalten indischer Epen. Auch der priesterliche Dienst Brahmans, des Göttlich-Alleinen, in Meditation und Kultus blieb ihm nicht fremd: „Ich wurde Priester wie es in Indien das Recht jedes Brahmanen ist." Der Weg der Väter wollte in natürlicher Entwicklung ganz der seine werden.

Da griff fremder Wille in sein Leben, der ihn zu einer besondern Stellung hinanführen wollte. In der Tat besaß Krishnamurti für sie die entsprechenden persönlichen Voraussetzungen. Körperliche Schönheit war ihm geschenkt — eine glückliche Mitgift für den, der andre beglücken soll. Dieser Leib war aber auch Transparent und Träger einer schönen Seele. Denn in Krishnamurtis geistiger Persönlichkeit ist nichts ungestaltet und roh; die körperlichen Triebe sind bewältigt und die Leidenschaften der Seele gebändigt. Mag zu dieser Haltung auch die Anlage seines Volkes und das Erbe seiner Herkunft mitgeholfen haben, so ist sie auch

persönlicher sittlicher Erwerb, weil sie nicht aus Leidenschaftslosigkeit erwachsen ist. Charakterisiert er doch das eigene Wesen mit dem Wort: „Das Genie hat immer einen Vulkan in sich, der Unruhe schafft, aus dem die Flammen bis in den Himmel emporschießen."

Seinem Menschentum eignet dazu Wahrhaftigkeit und Unabhängigkeit, Freundschaft und Menschenliebe. Krishnamurtis Eigenschaften gaben seiner Persönlichkeit das Recht, als Lehrer aufzutreten.

Zu dieser Aufgabe hat sich Krishnamurti erst allmählich durchgerungen. Dann auch seine Entwicklung vollzog sich im Irren, Kämpfen, Suchen, Finden. Nur mit zarter Andeutung spricht er von früheren Abwegen in der dritten Person. „Während er jung in der Entwicklung stand, sah er nur einen Wert, und der war die bloße Befriedigung des Körpers und der Freuden des Körpers." Bald aber gelang ihm die Disziplinierung des Leibes. „Nach und nach durch Foltern, durch Kasteiung im weiteren Leben gelangte er zur Beherrschung seines Körpers und meisterte gleichzeitig seine Gefühlserrungen und seinen Geist." Inzwischen aber hatten die tieferen seelischen Kämpfe um den letzten Sinn des Daseins eingesetzt. Da traf ihn die theosophische Verkündigung, daß große Meister zur Klarheit führen und er selbst zum Organ eines solchen ausersehen sei. Er gab seinem ersten Buch den Titel: „Zu den Füßen des Meisters." In ihm bekennt er demütig: „Das sind nicht meine Worte, sondern die des Meisters, der mich lehrte. Ohne ihn hätte ich nicht tun können, nur mit seiner Hilfe habe ich den Pfad betreten." In der Tat enthält diese Schrift deutliche Anklänge an theosophische Grundlehren, wie die von der Seelenwanderung, dem Karma, dem Gewinn höhere psychischer Kräfte, aber ein feineres Ohr vernimmt schon hier deutlich die eigene Grundmelodie von der ethischen Selbstgestaltung. Die Empfindung solcher Produktivität ließ Krishnamurtis Selbstbewußtsein wachsen. Von den Füßen eines fremden Meisters erhob er sich und glaubte in sich die Geburtswehen eines neuen Weltenlehrers zu spüren. „Bevor ich selbständig zu denken anfing, stand für mich fest, daß ich Krishnamurti das Gefäß des Weltenerlösers sei, weil viele behaupteten, es sei so." Er nennt diesen Welterlöser bald den brahmanischen Shri Krishna, bald Buddha, bald eine andre buddhistische Gestalt den Herren Maytreya, d. h. mit lauter Namen seiner indischen Heimat. Den Namen Jesu habe ich in seinen eigenen Aeußerungen nirgends gefunden. Die Begründung und zugleich Entschuldigung dieses Selbstbewußtseins führt Krishnamurti charakteristischerweise auf zwei Ursachen zurück: seine eigene Unselbständigkeit und die Behauptung andrer. Er hätte sich niemals

die Krone des Weltenerlösers aufgesetzt, aber er mußte sich eine Zeit gefallen lassen, daß andre seine noch nicht gereifte Gestalt mit ihr krönten; freimütig gibt er zu. „Es ist gut möglich während eines Lebensabschnittes etwas zu schreiben und es später zu widerrufen."

Sowie Krishnamurti selbständig geworden war — er datiert diese Zeit auf sein dreißigstes Lebensjahr 1927 — gab er diese besondre Einschätzung seiner Person auf und warf mit starker Energie den Purpur von den Schultern. „Ich bin ein gewöhnlicher Mensch" — lautete das schlichte Bekenntnis des reif gewordenen Krishnamurti. Alle Verschmelzung im theosophischen, metaphysischen Sinn mit einem höheren Geistwesen lehnt er mit aller Klarheit ab. **Er will nichts sein als ein Mensch, ein Beispiel, ein Lehrer.**

II.

Krishnamurtis Botschaft.

Krishnamurtis Botschaft wirkt zuerst durch ihre vollendete **ästhetische Gestaltung.** Sie bewegt sich nicht in der trockenen Form der Schulweisheit, sondern sucht selbst schon geprägte Worte zu gestalten und bedient sich dabei lebendiger Gleichnisse und von innen leuchtender Symbole, die aus tiefer Naturbeobachtung und feiner Einfühlung in das Menschenleben erwachsen sind. Seine Prosa, die in der Regel erst im Augenblick der Rede geboren wird, befindet sich nicht selten im Uebergang zur Poesie. Aber Krishnamurti übt die Selbstentäußerung des Lehrers, der seine Schüler gerade auch durch nüchterne Rede auf den Wesensgehalt seiner Botschaft konzentrieren will.

In einem seiner Bücher faßt Krishnamurti seine Verkündigung in dem Begriff des **Königreich Glück** zusammen, der in mancherlei Abwandlung auch in andern Werken wiederklingt und darum als Leitmotiv ihrer Darstellung dienen kann. Zur Erreichung eines fernen Reiches, wie es das Königreich Glück ist, bedarf es eines besonderen, nicht leicht zu findenden und zu begehenden **Weges.** Krishnamurti nennt ihn „die Stimme der Intuition." Sie ist eine geheimnisvolle Kraft, die angeboren sein muß und sich nicht erwerben läßt, die aber tief verschüttet ausgegraben und dann weiter entwickelt werden kann. Sie schließt Verstand und Erfahrung ein und verarbeitet diese zu höchster Schauung. „Steht dem Problem nicht rein gefühlsmäßig, nicht sentimental gegenüber, sondern gebraucht euren Verstand. In richtiger Weise angewandt, sollte der Verstand den meisten von uns die führende Kraft sein." Krishnamurti verwirft die rationale Funktion des Menschen durchaus nicht, um sie wie manche andre Botschafter der Gegenwart durch rein irrationale Visionen zu ersetzen.

Zum Verstand gehört aber auch das kritische Vermögen, das an Ding und Sachen das Wesentliche vom Unwesentlichen, das Vergängliche vom Unvergänglichen scheidet. Kritik nicht als launische und kleinliche Nörgelei verstanden reißt nicht nur nieder, sondern baut auch auf. Der Verstand ist jedoch nur ein formales Vermögen, ein Werkzeug, das seinen Stoff aus der Erfahrung gewinnen muß. Darum verlangt Krischnamurti auch ihre Berücksichtigung. „Aus vielen Erfahrungen, vielem Kummer, viel Seligkeit, viel Freude und Leid" erwächst erst der rechte Weg. Diese Erfahrung ist vor allen Dingen sittlicher Art, die Werte und Unwerte klar unterscheidet und den Trieb empfindet, sie auf ein höchstes Lebensziel teleologisch zu beziehen. In populäre Formel übersetzt kann man sagen, daß Krishnamurti die **Stimme des Gewissens** zum rufenden und führenden Herold in das Königreich Glück erwählt. In höhere wissenschaftlicher Analogie kann man sich an Kants Kritik der praktischen Vernunft erinnert fühlen, die auf vernünftigem, kritisch-sittlichem Weg die letzten Intuitionen, die höchsten menschlichen Werte und Ziele gewinnt.

Soll auf diesem Weg das wirkliche Königreich Glück erreicht werden, so gilt es **negativ** viele Provinzen zu meiden, die sich mit diesem Title unrechtmäßig schmücken. Krishnamurti beschreibt sie aus eingehender Beobachtung. „Der Mensch sucht in gemeinen Dingen nach jenem Glück, das ewig ist. Wenn er hungrig ist, sucht er seinen Magen zu sättigen; ist er von Sorgen gedrückt, so liegt sein Glück im Selbstvergessen." Noch farbiger und konkreter werden in einem Gedicht die falschen Glücksucher geschildert: „Die Dame von Welt, die auf Kleider und Geld sieht, die Frau, die sich schminkt, das Mädchen, das tändelt, der Mann, der sein Glück im Spielen findet, der Dichter, der die Größe seiner Gedanken und Träume in Worte kleidet." Zusammenfassend lautet das negative Urteil Krishnamurtis: „Das Reich der Glückseligkeit findet sich nicht in der Welt der Erscheinungen, wo Schatten und Verfall ist."

Krishnamurtis Botschaft scheint danach den Verzicht auf alle körperlichen und irdischen Befriedigungen, ja Betätigungen zu verlangen. Das ist aber weder im Einzelnen noch im Ganzen der Fall. Genießt Krishnamurti nicht nur selbst der Gaben der Erde, sondern bedient er sich auch der Errungenschaften moderner Technik, ja erklärt er sogar prinzipiell: „Ich habe nie entsagt," so gestattet und wünscht er diese Haltung auch andern Menschen. Krishnamurti verwirft auch nicht die ärztliche Kunst zur Erhaltung und Steigerung der Gesundheit. Nicht minder gilt es, die menschlichen Geisteskräfte positiv zu pflegen und zu trainieren, um eine „Vornehmheit der Empfindungen und des Verstandeslebens" und letzlich eine „ernste Heiterkeit" zu erwecken. **Weltflucht ist darum nicht das**

Ziel dieser Botschaft. Im Gegenteil fordert Krishnamurti „in den gegenwärtigen Zeiten, da ihr körperlich und geistig aufzubauen habt, müßt ihr in der Welt verbleiben und dort eure Befreiung und Glückseligkeit finden. Befreiung ist nicht Verneinendes, im Gegenteil etwas Bejahendes. Ihr müßt die Dinge eurer Umwelt schöner, edler, vollkommener gestalten, und doch müßt ihr euch gleichzeitig von ihnen lösen." Aber Krishnamurti kann auch umgekehrt die Entsagung der Weltbejahung vor- und überordnen: „Man muß vor allen Dingen völlig losgelöst sein von allen Bequemlichkeiten und dem Wunsch nach Besitz, vom grobem und verfeinertem Genuß. Man muß ein gewisses Minimum besitzen, aber ohne daran zu hängen, dann ist man diesen Dingen gegenüber frei und gleichgültig." Man wird der doppelten Einstellung Krishnamurtis: Verbleiben, ja Verschönerung der Welt und doch Lösung von ihr, am besten gerecht, wenn man auf sie die Formel anwendet, die der Nationalökonom Max Weber und der Religionsphilosoph Ernst Tröltsch für die geistige Haltung des älteren Protestantismus geprägt haben: **innerweltliche Askese.** Nicht äußere Flucht und Entsagung der Welt, im Gegenteil Verharren, ja Bereicherung in ihr ist die Aufgabe; aber bei ihrer Lösung gilt es die innere Freiheit von allen äußeren Gütern und die Fähigkeit zum Verzicht ohne jede Einbuße an seelischem Glück aufrechtzuerhalten.

Ist dies die grundlegende Beurteilung der Welt in Krischnamurtis Botschaft, so kann diese **keinerlei Gewicht auf die mechanische Umgestaltung der äußeren Welt legen.** Krishnamurti sagt einmal sehr charakteristisch, er hielte keinen soziologischen Vortrag, d. h. er befasse sich nicht mit den innerweltlichen Sozialformen und ihrer Umgestaltung. Nach seiner Stellung zur Ehe gefragt, antwortet er: „Reine Liebe kennt keine Unterscheidungen wie Gattin, Gatte, Sohn, Vater, Mutter. Nun geschieht es, daß man durch Heirat einem Menschen seine Liebe zuwendet und sie vielen versagt; man kann aber auch verheiratet sein und doch die Liebe zur ganzen Welt im Herzen tragen. Solche Liebe ist Zusammenwirken in wechselseitiger Erfahrung." Die Ehe selbst erscheint danach Krishnamurti nicht als Selbstzweck, wohl aber kann sie wirksames Mittel zur inneren Umgestaltung zweier Menschen werden. Für das Zusammenleben der Menschen wünscht auch Krishnamurti eine Mäßigung der Klassengegensätze und ein Aufhören der Völkerkriege. Trotzdem aber lehnt er es ab, in die innere oder äußere Politik einzugreifen mit der Begründung, daß er nur die Wurzeln, aber nicht die Zweige des Baumes zu pflegen habe. Alle Wandlungen können nur aus dem Inneren gewandelter Persönlichkeiten kommen. Ehe sich aber diese äußere Umgestaltung vollzogen hat, kann der Einzelne nur in **Kompromissen** leben, indem er sein unbeding-

tes Ideal so gut wie möglich mit den bedingten Verhältnissen auszugleichen sucht. „Im Physischen muß es natürlich Kompromisse geben. Wenn man in dieser Welt zu leben gezwungen ist, muß man Kompromisse schließen, sonst müßte man auf eine einsame Insel gehen. Bei einem Kompromiß muß immer einer leiden oder besser: jeder muß bei dem Kompromiß, den er macht, selber leiden. Wie weit er die Fähigkeit besitzt, aus der eigenen Kraft des Verstehens physische Zugeständnisse zu machen und dabei doch seelisch und geistig kompromißfrei zu bleiben, hängt von ihm selbst ab."

Liegt das Königreich Glück nicht in der Ebene dieser Welt, so muß es in einer andern Sphäre, in der des reinen Geistes mit seiner Wahrheit und seinem Frieden zur Verwirklichung gelangen. „Ich wünschte der letzten Wahrheit teilhaftig zu werden. Indem ich mir diese Wahrheit zu eigen mache, erlange ich gleichzeitig den gewünschten Frieden und die vollkommene Ruhe des Verstandes und Empfindungslebens." Aber was ist Wahrheit und was bringt Frieden? Diese entscheidende Frage löst Krishnamurti durch die **rechte Verhältnisbestimmung der menschlichen Individualität zum göttlichen Allsein** oder des vergänglichen Werdens zum ewigen Sein. 1930 kündet er als Hauptgegenstand seiner Reden an: „Individualität ist kein Ende an sich, das individuelle Dasein ist kein Endziel, sondern muß sich durch Verwirklichung der Totalität, der Einheit alles Lebens erfüllen." Individualität ist Begrenztheit in jeder Richtung. Sie wird von andern Persönlichkeiten wie von der ganzen Umwelt in Schranken gehalten. Sie reagiert infolgedessen nur auf die von außen kommenden Anstöße, ist dadurch unfrei, immer nur Ambos, der Schläge empfängt. Auch die Liebe des Individuums, eines Ich zu einem Du ist stets beschränkt, schließt andre aus und bringt mehr Leid als Freude, mehr Unruhe als Befriedigung. Individualität ist daher ihrem eigenen Wesen nach Unvollkommenheit oder nach einem recht charakteristischen Bild eine „Narbe des Lebens." Dann kann ihr Zweck aber nur sein, daß sie überwunden, mindestens abgeschliffen wird und zwar schon im gegenwärtigen Dasein, im „Jetzt," und nicht etwa erst in späteren Daseinsformen. Alles kommt darauf an, schon jetzt diese Sondereristenz im Fühlen, Denken, Handeln aufzulösen. Die Liebe scheidet sich von der Bezogenheit und Begrenztheit auf ein einzelnes Du, das Erkennen haftet nicht mehr an den Sonderformen und trennenden Begriffen, das Handeln erhebt sich über die Reaktionen auf innerweltliche Einzeleindrücke.

Dieses Vernichten geht aber unmerklich in ein **Vollenden** über. Krishnamurti sieht die Gewinnung des Glückes gewiß zunächst in der negativen Ablösung von Schalen, in dem Zerstören des Unwesentlichen, aber mehr noch in der Heraushebung des Kernes, in

der Verwirklichung des Wesentlichen. Im Einzelwesen ist die Totalität angelegt, im individuellen Atem weht der Weltatem: „Die Gesamtheit des Lebens ist in jedem Einzelwesen vorhanden." Erscheint auf der einen Seite in den auch von Krishnamurti gebrauchten zeitlosen Bildern der Mystik die Auflösung des Tropfens im Meer, des Stromes im Ozean, so rauscht umgekehrt schon im Fluß das ewige Meer, spiegelt sich im Tautropfen die ganze Himmelssonne. Eigentliches Lebensziel wird darum, die in der Individualität gebundene Totalität herzulösen und rein darzustellen. Die Erreichung trägt positiven Charakter: „Das ist kein Zustand ewig währenden Schlafes, noch ist es ein Zustand vollkommener Auslöschung. Es ist Freiheit des Bewußtseins, ungehindertes Sein, Leben, reine Handlung." In diesem Zustand sind auch Wahrheit und Glück gewonnen. Denn Wahrheit ist im Unterschied zur Vergänglichkeit die Wesenhaftigkeit, im Gegensatz zum Werden das reine Sein. Ihr entspricht im Empfindungsleben das Gefühl positiver beglückender Erfüllung. In prosaischen und poetischen Formeln, die letztlich aber nicht mehr sein können und wollen als schattenhafte Andeutungen umschreibt Krishnamurti dieses höchste Glück: „Die Verwirklichung absoluter Glückseligkeit ist ein Zustand, in dem es kein objektives und kein subjektives Bewußtsein gibt — es ist der Zustand reinen Seins." „Reines Sein, reines Leben, ist jenseits von Raum und Zeit, und da es jenseits ist, ist es ein ungestörtes, heiteres, ruhiges, biegsames Glück." In poetischer Gestalt spricht sich dieses Glücksempfinden temperamentvoller und gesättigter, aber auch irdischer aus: „Wenn du frei und ohne Fesseln bist, wenn dein Körper beherrscht und gelöst, wenn dein Blick alles rein und lückenlos sieht, wenn dein Herz voller Liebe und klar ist, deine Seele ausgeglichen, dann o Welt, ist das Tor des Gartens, das Reich des Glücks dir geöffnet." „Siehe, die Stunde ist da, die Stunde, um die ich gewußt, ich bin befreit, frei von Leben und Tod. Freuden und Sorgen suchen mich nicht heim, losgelöst bin ich in Liebe, jenseits der Träume der Götter."

Aufgehen der Individualität im Alleben, Erfüllung der Persönlichkeit durch die Totalität, Erhabensein über Raum und Zeit, Leben und Tod, Befriedigung durch reines Sein — das ist für Krishnamurti der eigentliche Gehalt des Königreiches Glück.

Ist damit sein sittlich persönlicher Sinn begriffen, so gibt er ihm zu seiner Begründung und Krönung einen **metaphysisch-religiösen Rahmen.** Dieser kann nicht in einem persönlichen Gott bestehen, denn mit dem Wort der menschlichen Persönlichkeit fällt auch die Gottes: „Für mich gibt es nichts derartiges wie einen persönlichen Gott!" Persönliche Götter sind nichts als Erfindun-

gen menschlicher Furcht und Phantasie, die konkreten Glaubensvorstellungen und kultischen Handlungen aller Religionen nichtig und wertlos. In einem Gedicht „O Freund, sprich mir von Gott" durchwandert Krishnamurti alle Religionen, die vedische und buddhistische, die christliche und die mohammedanische, um mit dem Bekenntnis zu enden: „Müde bin ich und erschöpft im Wandel der Zeit. Ich folgte keinem Pfad und fand zu dir. Du hast dich selbst mir offenbart. Mein Suchen ist zu Ende. In dir erschau ich alles. Ich selbst bin Gott." Der Mensch findet das Göttliche jederzeit und überall. Krishnamurti bekennt sich zum **Weltbild und zur Weltanschauung des Pantheismus**: „Mir ist Wahrheit Leben, das Leben aller Dinge, vom Höchsten bis zum Niedrigsten, vom Belebten bis zum Unbelebten." In seinen Gedichten strömt in glühenden Hymnen das Bekenntnis zur religiösen und metaphysischen Allgöttlichkeit aus dem Mund des Dichters.

Autoritätsglauben oder inneres Erlebnis.

G. Fr. Schuetze.

Man hat die beiden Begriffe, Autoritätsglauben und inneres Erlebnis, schon des öfteren einander als unversöhnliche Gegensätze gegenüber gestellt. Den Autoritätsglauben hat man als die katholische Form des Christentums bezeichnet und dem inneren Erlebnis, als der evangelischen Form, diametral gegenüber gesetzt. Es liegt ein Kern von Wahrheit in dieser Aufstellung; jedoch so allgemein, uneingeschränkt und für alle Fälle, läßt sich die These nicht verteidigen. Wohl müssen wir zugeben, daß bei vielen katholischen Christen der Glaube an die Autorität, besonders die der Kirche, diejenige Form ist, unter der sich das katholische Glaubensleben betätigt. Aber es hieße doch das Kind mit dem Bad ausschütten, wenn man behaupten wollte, daß dies bei allen Katholiken der Fall sei, und daß bei keinem katholischen Christen das Christentum, auch in der spezifisch katholischen Form, zum inneren Erlebnis werden könne. Franziskus von Assisi ist eine der glänzendsten Widerlegungen dieser verallgemeinerten These. Auch der Fanatismus der katholischen Christen würde sich nur sehr schwer, wenn überhaupt, als Ausfluß des Autoritätsglaubens erklären lassen. Gerade die uns so abstoßenden Erscheinungen des Fanatismus, die Inquisition, die Hexenprozesse, die Flagellanten, die Kreuzzüge usw. werden uns menschlich verständlich erst dann, wenn wir sie als Folgen eines inneren Erlebnisses ansprechen. Wohl ist dieses innere Erlebnis ein Zerrbild des biblischen Christentums und „toto mundo" von dem Evangelium verschieden, aber es muß da gewesen sein. Wäre dieses nicht der Fall, könnten wir Vieles in der vorreformatorischen Kirchengeschichte entweder nur als Priesterbetrug oder als pathologische Erscheinungen, als psychopathische Erkrankungen ansehen. Ersteres zu tun verbietet uns der Anstand; gegen letzteres spricht die lange Dauer und häufige Wiederholung. Selbst gesetzt den Fall, daß erstmalig eine der beiden Eventualitäten vorgelegen habe, so ist es doch klar, daß bei den Nachfolgern ein inneres Erleben dazugekommen sein muß. Wir geben ein „proton pseudos" als Möglichkeit zu, behaupten aber, daß darnach ein Empfinden und Erleben stattgefunden haben muß. Es wäre nicht recht, der ganzen katholischen Kirche die Ehrlichkeit absprechen zu wollen. Aus ehrlicher Ueberzeugung heraus, Gott damit einen Dienst zu leisten, hat die Katholische Kirche viele Taten begangen, die wir ohne diese Voraussetzung einfach nicht verstehen könnten. Man denke an die Inquisition. Die vielen tausende von gefolterten und verbrannten Häretikern, Juden, Mohammedanern und Heiden sind nicht gestorben, weil die Autorität der Kirche es nun einmal so verlangte, son-

dern weil die Inquisitoren der ehrlichen Herzensüberzeugung waren, daß **Gott** es so verlange und wolle.

Anderseits aber ist das innere Herzenserlebnis durchaus nicht unbedingter Alleinbesitz der evangelischen Kirchen. Wohl ist dies Erlebnis das Ideal des evangelischen, nachreformatorischen Glaubens; aber — Hand aufs Herz — bei wie vielen Protestanten ist diese Ideal vollkommen oder auch nur bedingtermaßen erfüllt? Sehen wir es denn nicht im praktischen Pfarramt jeden Tag, daß der Glaube, der angeblich allein selig machende, nur ein oberlfächlich aufgetragener Firnis ist, und daß viele, ach nur gar zu viele, von dem inneren Erleben der Evangeliumswahrheiten keine blasse Spur haben? Sehr oft können wir es erleben, und zwar leider oft an unsern besten Gemeindegliedern, daß der ganze Unetrschied zwischen dem evangelischen und dem katholischen Glauben der ist, daß die Autorität der katholischen Kirche eine lebendige ist, repräsentiert durch das Priestertum mit dem Papst an der Spitze, und im Leben des Einzelnen durch die Person des Pfarrgeistlichen fühlbar gemacht, während auf der andern Seite in allen Zweigen des Protestantismus — am meisten in der lutherischen und der evangelischen Kirche, weniger bei den Sekten — die Autorität eine tote ist, die Bibel. Im doppelten Sinn eine tote, einmal weil dem Träger der Botschaft der Bibel, dem Pastor, alle Autorität verweigert wird, die er sich nicht selbst mühsam erkämpft, und anderseits weil die Bibel zu oft nur eine Art von Fetisch im Haus ist. Man hat sie im Haus, aber man gebraucht sie nicht. Man weiß in schattenhaften Umrissen ungefähr ihren Inhalt, aber man macht ihn sich nicht zu eigen. Der Buchstabe tötet. Auch bei den Sekten ist schließlich und letzten Endes der Glaube ein toter Autoritätsglaube, ob diese tote Autorität nun Wesley, Whitefield, Spurgeon, Moody, Campbell, Otterbein, Albrecht (ich greife blindlings nur ein paar Namen heraus) oder vielleicht gar Billy Sunday heißt. Wir geben zu, daß bei den Sektierern der Autoritätsglaube leichter zum inneren Erlebnis werden kann. Das dürfen wir zurückführen auf den Umstand, daß in der Sektiererei vorwiegend Nachdruck gelegt wird auf das Gemüt und das innere Leben und das äußerliche Korrektiv der Bibelautorität vernachlässigt wird, während in der lutherischen wie der evangelischen Kirche der Verstand, wenn auch nicht vorherrschend, so doch mit dem Gefühl gleichberechtigt ist, daher für etwaige Ausschweifungen des Innenlebens stets das Korrektiv und Regulativ vorhanden ist.

Kann denn nun keine der beiden Kirchen ausschließlich die eine oder die andre der beiden Glaubensformen beanspruchen, sondern finden wir in allen Kirchen beide Erscheinungsformen des christlichen Glaubens nebeneinander, zum Teil auch stark miteinander ver-

mischt — in den wenigsten Fällen nur finden wir nur nackten Autoritätsglauben oder nur inneres Erlebnis, sondern meistens beides miteinander und nebeneinander in verschiedenen Zusammensetzungen — so mag es angebracht und interessant sein, einmal das Verhältnis dieser beiden Glaubensformen, oder richtiger Glaubensstufen, zu einander zu beobachten, und eine richtige Wertschätzung derselben zu erlangen.

Als die primäre, weil primitive Glaubensform ist in allen Religionen unbedingt der Autoritätsglaube anzusehen. Das ist logisch einfach, weil der innerlichen Verarbeitung eines Eindrucks doch erst dieser äußerliche Eindruck vorangehen muß. Erst muß der Glaube äußerlich als Autoritätsforderung an das Herz herangebracht sein, ehe der innere Mensch ihn geistig verarbeiten und sich zu eigen machen kann. Eine psychologische Erwägung wird uns das bestätigen. Als in urvordenklichen Zeiten die Wilden bei dem Rollen des Donners sich erschreckt in ihren Höhlen verkrochen, taten sie es, weil sie in ihm die Stimme der Gottheit zu vernehmen meinten. Wie kamen sie dazu? Irgend ein besonders von Schuld bedrückter Vater, eine besonders furchtsame Mutter mögen die ersten gewesen sein, die in diesen elementaren Naturerscheinungen die Stimme eines höheren Wesens zu vernehmen glaubten. Es mag sein, daß ein Blitz einen aus ihrer Mitte tötete. Das konnten sie nicht anders erklären als durch eine höhere Macht. So lehrten sie es denn ihre Kinder, und von da ab wurde es für eine unumstößliche Gewißheit gehalten, daß Gott im Donner rede und im Blitz strafe. Da haben wir Autoritätsglauben in krassester Form, das Vertrauen auf die Lehren der Vorfahren. Oder nehmen wir den Fetischismus, oder das Tabu der Südseeinsulaner. Sie beruhen auf dem Autoritätsglauben. Der König, der Priester, der Stammesälteste hat es gesagt, also muß es wahr sein. Aber lassen wir die verschiedenen heidnischen Religionsformen und wenden uns den biblischen Berichten zu. Bei den ersten Menschen im Paradiesgarten finden wir ebenfalls kein inneres Erleben der Gemeinschaft mit Gott, im allerbesten Fall ein unbewußtes Stehen in der Gemeinschaft, in der Hauptsache ein Unterwerfen unter die göttliche Autorität. Das Weib antwortete der Schlange: Von den Bäumen hat Gott gesagt (1. Mose 3, 3). Und bei ihrem Versuch zur Verführung wußte die Schlange es nicht besser anzufangen und konnte keinen besseren Erfolg erzielen, als indem sie den Autoritätsglauben unterwühlte. Ja, sollte Gott? Wir finden also den Glauben an seine Autorität, und zwar an eine über dem Menschen stehende, absolute und darum göttliche Bürgschaft als durchaus nicht unvereinbar mit der ersten Gottesoffenbarung, sondern vielmehr als die unerläßlich notwendige Grundlage alles religiösen

Lebens. Das finden wir bestätigt durch die ganze erste Periode der Reichsgottesgeschichte. Gott sprach zu Noah, zu Abraham usw., obwohl wir nicht verkennen können, daß Abraham nicht bei dem bloßen Autoritätsglauben stehen blieb. Als dann die Urgeschichte abschloß und eine neue Zeit eingeläutet wurde durch die Gesetzgebung auf dem Berg Sinai, da wurde der Glaube erst recht als Autoritätsglaube befestigt. Israel hatte das äußerliche Erlebnis der Theophanie vom Berg, zum innerlichen Erleben gelangte die große Masse des Volks noch lange nicht. Es blieb nach wie vor bei dem alten Autoritätsglauben. Nur daß dieser jetzt auf viel festerer und sicherer Grundlage ruhte, dem in zwei Steintafeln gehauenen Gesetz Gottes. Die Autorität, die das Leben des Menschen religiös beeinflußt und gestaltet, braucht ja eben durchaus nicht immer eine lebendige, befehlende Person zu sein; im Gegenteil werden wir immer finden, daß eine Autorität, die für sich den Nimbus des Altehrwürdigen, von grauer Vorzeit Herrührenden, in Anspruch nehmen kann, viel sicherer und dem Umsturz viel weniger ausgesetzt ist, als eine nur auf den Mund eines lebenden Zeugen gegründete. Es war während der vierzigjährigen Wüstenwanderung Israels, auch in menschlich politischer Hinsicht, von Mose sehr weise gehandelt, daß er sich Priester, Aelteste und Leviten als lebendige Zeugen und Stützen seiner Autorität einsetzte. Seine Autorität war noch zu jung, als daß sie über alle Angriffe erhaben gewesen wäre. Vielmehr ist es von allen Aufrühren dieser Zeit zu beobachten, daß sie alle mehr oder minder eine Auflehnung gegen die Autorität des Moses gewesen, nie gegen Gott selbst; vergleiche die Heimkehr der Kundschafter (4. Mose 14, 4), den Aufruhr der Rotte Korah (4. Mose 16, 3), das Haderwasser (4. Mose 20, 5). Später aber, als Jahrhunderte verstrichen waren, war das Verhältnis umgekehrt: die Auflehnung richtete sich nicht mehr gegen die Träger der Autorität, die Priester, sondern gegen die Autorität selber, gegen Gott. Selten, sehr selten finden wir in Israel ein inneres Erlebnis des Jehovaglaubens. Immer sind es nur vereinzelte, hervorragende Leiter des Volkes, bei denen wir ein Hinauswachsen über den herkömmlichen Autoritätsglauben finden können, Moses, Samuel, Davids Psalmen, und die Propheten, sonst nicht.

Wenden wir uns nun dem Neuen Testament zu. Da empfinden wir sofort den ungeheueren Unterschied. Der Heiland ist mit dem äußeren Autoritätsglauben nicht zufrieden gestellt. Seine ganz bestimmte und immer wieder erneuerte Forderung geht auf das Erleben der Erlösung. Zwar verwirft er die Autorität durchaus nicht (Matth. 5, 18), (Luk. 16, 29); aber seine sittlichen, geistlichen Forderungen gehen doch weit über dieses Autoritäts-

vertrauen hinaus. Vergleiche die Anbetung im Geist (Joh. 4, 24), das Bleiben an seiner Rede, das zu rechten Jüngern macht, (Joh. 8, 31) die Forderung des Glaubens an ihn (Joh. 14, 1), die Verheißung solchen Glaubens (Joh. 7, 31). Anderseits ist aber der Zimmermannssohn aus Nazareth der größte Revolutionär aller Zeiten gegen menschliche Autoritäten gewesen, vergleiche seine Haltung in der Sabbathfrage und seine Stellungnahme gegen die Aufsätze der Aeltesten. Er könnte es verschmähen, sich auf menschliche Autoritäten zu berufen, weil er mit dem Anspruch auftrat, die alleinige, rechte Autorität zu sein. Wohl ist ihm die göttliche Autorität heilig und unantastbar, aber menschliche verwarf er unbedingt und ganz, höchstens daß er sich ihrer gelegentlich zur Widerlegung der Pharisäer und Schriftgelehrten bediente. Seine eigene Autorität, die er mit der göttlichen gleichstellt, soll vielmehr die Grundlage des Glaubens seiner Jünger bilden, von der aus sie zum inneren Erleben der Wahrheit gelangen sollen. Seinen Aposteln predigt er den Glauben auf göttliche Autorität hin. Selig sind, die nicht sehen und doch glauben.

Irgend etwas muß die Unterlage des Glaubens bilden, ehe man zum inneren Erleben gelangen kann. „Worauf soll der Glaube ruhn?" Bei den ersten Jüngern beruhte er nach Petri Bekenntnis auf dem Schauen, „wir haben geglaubt und erkannt, daß du bist Christus" (Joh. 6, 69), oder wie Johannes als Augenzeuge (1. Joh. 1, 1) es sagt, „wir haben erkannt und geglaubt die Liebe." (1. Joh. 4, 16.) Zu beachten ist die Verschiedenheit in der Wortstellung, in welcher der verschiedene Werdegang der beiden Jünger angedeutet liegt. Petrus sieht erst voll Staunens die Macht und Liebe Jesu. Durch ein inneres Erlebnis glaubt er an den Messias. Aber sein Glaube entbehrt der Autorität; deshalb ist er unsicher und schwankend (vergleiche die Verleugnung). Später findet er (nach der Auferstehung) sein Herzenserlebnis durch die Autorität der Worte Christi bestätigt und ist seitdem der Felsenmann. Ganz anders aber Johannes. Er geht über die Kopferkenntnis an die Autorität zum Glauben, zum inneren Erleben der Liebe Jesu. Das Endergebnis ist bei beiden dasselbe, das Zusammenwirken von äußerer Autorität und innerem Erleben bringt den rechten christlichen Glauben hervor. Das finden wir auch in der apostolischen Generation bestätigt. Nach der Himmelfahrt des Heilands und der Ausgießung des heiligen Geistes verkündigen seine Jünger den Gekreuzigten und Auferstandenen und versuchen die Menge zum Herrn zu bekehren. Zu diesem Behufe können sie einer Autorität nicht entbehren. Paulus legt das ganz offen dar. Der Glaube kommt aus der Predigt, die Predigt aber aus dem Wort Gottes (Röm. 10, 17). Also ist das Wort Gottes die

Autorität, auf der alles Glauben und innere Erleben beruht. Daher finden wir in allen Schriften des Neuen Testaments immer wieder ein Hinweisen auf diese Autorität. Wohl am meisten läßt sich dieser Hinweis bei Matthäus in seiner Predigt an das Volk Israel fest stellen, viel weniger bei dem für Heidenchristen schreibenden Lukas und am allerwenigsten bei dem „geistlichen Evangelium" des Zebedaiden. Wir übergehen den Markus, da er nach dem Zeugnis des Papias die Predigt des Petrus wiedergibt. Bei Jakobus tritt die Frage ganz in den Hintergrund. Er hat als Thema nicht die objektive äußere oder innere Bezeugung der Botschaft, sondern die subjektive und aktive Bezeugung derselben durch das tägliche Leben. Was die Schriften des Petrus angeht, so ist es, und kann es in dem Rahmen dieses Aufsatzes nicht unsre Aufgabe sein, kritisch über die Authentizität derselben zu urteilen. Ist den der 2. Petri von dem Apostel geschrieben, so finden wir in ihm allerdings ein sehr starkes Betonen der Autorität der Schrift als der Grundlage des Glaubens (2. 1, 16—19). Aber ebenso sehr weist Petrus hin auf die lebendige Hoffnung (1. 1, 3) und die Wiedergeburt (1. 1, 23). Paulus endlich ist auch darin ein getreuer Jünger seines Meisters, daß er alle menschliche Autorität unbedingt verwirft (Eph. 6, 6; 1. Kor. 15, 32), selbst die der Urapostel (Gal. 1, 10; 2, 11). Auf der andern Seite aber fordert er ebenso energisch die Unterwerfung unter die Autorität, sei es menschlicher in bürgerlichen Dingen (Röm. 13), oder göttlicher in himmlischen Dingen (2. Tim. 3, 16). Ja er scheut sich sogar nicht, seine eigene Autorität einzusetzen (Phil. 3, 17); jedoch nie so, daß er sie neben, gegen oder über Gott setzt. Auch fordert er durchaus mit allem Nachdruck ein inneres Erleben der Wahrheit des Evangeliums. Das ist so allgemein bekannt, daß ich mich darauf beschränken kann, zwei oder drei der allerbekanntesten Stellen anzuführen (Röm. 5, 1; 1, 16; 1. Kor. 1, 18).

Rekapitulieren wir: Im Neuen Testament ist es sowohl des Heilands wie aller seiner Jünger Lehre, daß der Autoritätsglaube, neben dem innerlichen Erlebnis steht, unbedingt notwendig ist, um zum inneren, geistigen Erleben zu führen.

Mit dem Abschluß der apostolischen Zeit finden wir ein sofortiges Sinken des geistlichen Niveaus. Der tötende Buchstabe war geblieben, der belebende Geist war verschwunden. Ignatius (vergleiche Klein: Aus der Schatzkammer heiliger Väter, Heft 8) vergleicht den Bischof mit Gott dem Vater und fordert für ihn vor allem Gehorsam. Ebenso stellt sich Irenäus von Lyons: quapropter eis, qui in Ecclesia sunt, presbyteris obedire opportet (Adv. Haer. IV. xxvi. 1). So sehen wir eine Bewegung eingeleitet, die äußerlich in die Erscheinung tritt im monarchischen Episkopat, innerlich

aber in der Forderung desselben auf unbedingten Gehorsam, mit andern Worten der Errichtung der römischen Hierarchie. Wir nehmen hier vorweg, was ja allbekannt ist, daß diese Bewegung im Jahre 1870 ihre einstweilige Spitze und Beendigung fand in der Proklamation der Lehre von der Unfehlbarkeit des Papstes. Ob und in welcher Richtung diese Lehre noch ausgebaut werden mag, steht dahin. Jedenfalls ist durch diese Bewegung die Forderung des innerlichen Erlebnisses ganz in den Hintergrund gedrängt, wenn nicht gänzlich beseitigt. Dadurch hat denn auch die eingangs erwähnte Ansicht Boden gewonnen, daß der Autoritätsglaube **die katholische Form** des Christentums ist. Daß diese These irrig ist, haben wir nachgewiesen. Jedenfalls hat sich die Hierarchie nicht auf einmal und nicht ohne schwere Kämpfe durchsetzen können. Das Mönchswesen und alle die vorreformatorischen Bewegungen sind alle mehr oder minder ursprünglich Versuche, dem subjektiven Christentum Geltung zu verschaffen. Die Kirche, ihre Autorität gefährdet sehend, hat sie zu unterdrücken gewußt oder aber mit scheinbarer Nachgiebigkeit ihrem Organismus einverleibt und ihren Zwecken dienstbar gemacht.

Der erste Mann, den Rom nicht mundtot machen konnte in seiner Forderung nach einem subjektiven Erleben des Christentums war Dr. Martin Luther. Von diesem Gesichtspunkt aus ist das Wesen der Reformation aufzufassen als eine Nachfolge Jesu und Pauli in einer grundsätzlichen Rebellion gegen allen äußeren Autoritätszwang und als Behauptung der eigenen Individualität. Luthers Kampf gegen alle andern Mißbräuche der katholischen Kirche hätten ihr nicht einen solchen Schlag versetzen können. Ein neues Prinzip, d. h. eigentlich ein uraltes, aber durch lange Vergessenheit als neu wirkende, trat auf den Plan und errang den Sieg.

Mit dem einmaligen Sieg aber war leider das Prinzip noch nicht für alle Zeiten gesichert. Mit dem Aufkommen der lutherischen Orthodoxie war der Grundgedanke des innerlichen Erlebens aufgegeben. So und nur so ist es zu erklären, daß in der neueren Kirchengeschichte eine Sekte nach der andern auftreten konnte. Sie alle forderten ein innerliches Erleben der einen oder der andern christlichen Wahrheit. Und darin liegt eben der Fehler der neueren Sekten. Wir finden nicht so sehr die Forderung nach dem inneren Erleben der **ganzen** christlichen Wahrheit, sondern eben immer nur einer Seite, auf die man, d. h. der Gründer der Gemeinschaft, ein besonderes Gewicht legte. So werden wir es auch erklären können, daß alle diese neueren Kirchengründungen ein mehr oder weniger schiefes und verzerrtes Abbild des Leibes Christi geben. In jeder finden wir Punkte und Seiten, denen der evangelische Christ mit Freuden und ganz zustimmen kann, in jeder aber auch Punkte und

Seiten, die durch ihre maßlose Betonung andres, ebenso wichtiges, verdrängen und darum unsern Widerspruch hervorrufen müssen. Als typisches Beispiel möchte ich nur die als Quäker bekannte Gemeinschaft herbeiziehen. Ihre Forderung des „Inneren Lichtes" ist gewiß nicht unrecht. Wenn sie aber so weit geht, zur Verwerfung der Gnadenmittel und des Predigtamtes fortzuschreiten, dann trennen sich eben unsre Wege, weil dem inneren, subjektiven Erlebnis das Korrektiv und Regulativ der äußeren Autorität fehlt.

Wir sind am Ende. Es erübrigt nur, noch einmal zusammenzufassen und das Resultat der obigen Darlegungen auszusprechen: Entbehren können wir keine der beiden Glaubensformen, also auch keine verwerfen. Der Autoritätsglauben muß vorhanden sein, und zwar in erster Reihe, dann aber muß das innere Erlebnis dazu kommen. Ein bloßer Autoritätsglauben, die „fides implicita" der katholischen Kirche, ist ein totes Glauben (nicht ein Glaube) und kann nicht zur vollen Gemeinschaft mit Christo führen. Wiederum ein nur innerliches Erlebnis ohne das Normativ der Bibelautorität, führt zur Schwarmgeisterei und vermeintlicher, aber nicht wirklicher Gemeinschaft mit dem Sohn Gottes. An uns als Predigern des ganzen Evangeliums von Christo Jesu, ist es, uns vor beiden Extremen zu hüten und in der Verbindung der beiden Seiten **den Weg, die Wahrheit und das Leben** für uns selbst zu finden und den uns anvertrauten Seelen zu zeigen.

Die Gemeinde zu Jerusalem.

Ed. Schweizer, P. em., Marion, Ill.

1. **Der gute Stand im Anfang.** „Der Menge aber der Gläubigen war ein Herz und eine Seele." „Sie blieben aber beständig in der Apostel Lehre," von sämtlichen Aposteln gepflegt, „waren täglich und stets beieinander einmütig im Tempel und brachen das Brot hin und her in Häusern," denn es war unmöglich, daß die nach Tausende zählende Gemeinde sich an **einer** Stelle zum Gottesdienst versammeln konnte. Sie hielten aber treu an der Gemeinschaft, am Brotbrechen und am Gebet fest. Genossen ihre Nahrung mit freudiger Danksagung und in Herzenseinfalt, priesen Gott und standen mit dem ganzen Volk in gutem Einvernehmen, machten sich nicht mißliebig mit Strafreden und mit Bekehrungsversuchen. Der Herr aber fügte ihrer Gemeinde täglich solche, die das Heil erlangten, zu festem Anschluß hinzu. Das Glück, die Liebe und Bescheidenheit dieser ersten Christen machte auf das Volk den besten Eindruck und war die Ursache des raschen Wachstums der Gemeinde.

2. **Das Glaubensbekenntnis der Gemeinde.** Sie hielten fest an der Apostel Lehre und glaubten, daß Jesus der verheißene und so sehnlich erwartete Messias und König war. Nicht bloß Davids Sohn, sondern Gottes Sohn, und nicht im niedrigen Sinn einer bloßen Adoption, sondern in der Ueberzeugung von des Herrn Jesu göttlicher Wesenheit, sonst würde Jakobus Jesum wohl nicht den „Herrn der Herrlichkeit" genannt haben, Jak. 2, 1. Das für die Juden so verhängnisvolle Aergernis am Kreuz des Messias war bei den Christen zu Jerusalem getilgt durch die Gewißheit der leibhaften Auferstehung Jesu und seiner Wiederkunft zur Aufrichtung seiner Herrschaft.

Des Herrn Jesu Auferstehung aus seinem Grab und sein Wiederkommen sind für den Christenglauben von höchster Wichtigkeit. „Mit großer Kraft — mit der absoluten Gewißheit der Augenzeugenschaft — geben die Apostel Zeugnis von der Auferstehung des Herrn Jesu." Nicht allein die Zwölfe, sondern auch Paulus, und zwar in seinen von der schärfsten Kritik für echt erklärten Episteln. So auch der noch vor der Zerstörung Jerusalems geschriebene, aus der Umgebung des Paulus stammende. Hebräerbrief. „Das Leben Jesu hat mit der einzigdastehenden Tatsache geendet: mit seiner Auferstehung aus dem Grab. Auch die schärfste Kritik muß zugeben, daß dieser Abschluß des Lebens und Werkes Christi für den Glauben der ersten Christen eine unzweifelhafte Tatsache gewesen ist," sagt Oehninger. Selbst Strauß gibt zu, daß ohne ein solches Ereignis die Begeisterung der so sehr entmutigten

Apostel und der Glaube der ersten Christen sich nicht erklären ließen.

Es kann einem leid sein, daß auch gefeierte Theologen sich nicht zum Glauben an Jesu Auferstehung erheben konnten. Schleiermacher war eine sehr würdige Persönlichkeit, die auf alle, die mit ihm bekannt wurden, einen angenehmen Eindruck machte. Dabei war er ein Theologe ersten Ranges, dem die Theologie und Kirche viel zu verdanken haben. Als Student las ich sein „Leben Jesu" und fand darin seinen Glauben an die elende Scheintodhypothese. Mit Recht hat Strauß von diesem „Leben Jesu" gesagt: es sei die tönernen Füße zum blanken Gußbild der Schleiermacherschen Theologie, und seine Schüler hätten besser getan, wenn sie dieses Manuskript ihres Meisters nicht hätten drucken lassen.

Die sogenannte „Visionstheorie" in ihren verschiedenen Formen hat den Glauben der Apostel zu erklären versucht. Am „leeren Grab" muß sie scheitern. Es muß beim Zeugnis der Apostel bleiben, und wer darüber hinweg und daran vorbei will, verdient keine Beachtung.

Wie mit dem Glauben an die Auferstehung, so verhält es sich auch mit dem Glauben an das Wiederkommen des Herrn. Der Herr hat oft und mit unmißverständlicher Klarheit von seinem Kommen mit großer Macht und Herrlichkeit geredet, und wohl unterschieden zwischen seinem Kommen zum Gericht über Jerusalem und seinem Erscheinen am Ende dieser Weltzeit. Die Apostel haben des Herrn Aufschlüsse angenommen, und durch sie ist der Glaube an des Herrn Wiederkommen zur lebhaften Erwartung der Gemeinde geworden.

An diese große Hoffnung der Christenheit hat sich etwas Phantasterei gehängt, und ihre Erfüllung wurde auch zu früh erwartet. Daran waren der Herr und seine Apostel nicht schuld. Aber der Glaube an Christi Parusie ist dadurch in Mißkredit geraten, auch in sonst gläubigen Kreisen. Ein amerikanischer Pastor wagte zu sagen: „Christus kommt in mein Herz, ein anders Kommen gibt es nicht." Worauf beruht denn bei diesen Leuten ihr Christenglaube, wenn sie so leicht über die Schriftaussagen hinwegkommen? Da kommt es zu verschiedenem und wunderlichem Glauben. Ein römischer Bischof z. B. hat es an seinem Herzen erfahren, daß die Maria Himmelskönigin sei!

3. **Der Kultus der Gemeinde** war der gewohnte jüdische Gottesdienst. Sie besuchten den Tempel, brachten Tieropfer, hielten die jüdischen Feiertage, ließen ihre Söhne beschneiden. Mit einem Wort: sie gingen einher in allen Satzungen des Judentums und waren „Eiferer über dem Gesetz," wie Jakobus später dem Paulus sagte. Es war also zwischen ihnen und den nicht gläubigen Juden

kein andrer Unterschied als der, daß sie glaubten, Jesus sei der Messias, der Sohn Gottes, von den Toten auferstanden, gen Himmel gefahren, von dannen er wiederkommen werde. Das war ja nicht wenig; aber die Hauptsache fehlte: das **Kreuz!** Unleugbar haben sie die Bedeutung des Todes Christi nicht begriffen. Von Sühne der Sünde und Vergebung durch Christi Blut, von einer Gerechtigkeit aus Gnaden durch den Glauben wußten sie nichts. Sie kannten keine andre Gerechtigkeit als die des Gesetzes. Auch der ehrwürdige Jakobus, das Haupt der Gemeinde, nicht. In seiner Epistel ist von Christi Tod kein Wort enthalten. Wie kann man denn behaupten, Jakobus und Paulus seien **eines** Sinnes gewesen! Jakobus hat eine sehr geringe Vorstellung vom Glauben und hält ihn bloß für ein Fürwahrhalten von unleugbaren Wahrheiten, wie ihn auch die Teufel haben können.

4. **Die üblen Folgen der Verbundenheit mit dem Gesetz und Judentum.** Meines Wissens litt die Gemeinde in den sechziger Jahren Verfolgung. Jakobus, „der Gerechte," wie er von allen Juden genannt wurde, litt den Märtyrertod, die Christen wurden exkommuniziert. Das brachte sie in Verzweiflung. Denn ohne Tempel und Altar, ohne Priester und Opfer schien ihnen alles verloren. Sie glaubten sich vom Bund mit Gott ausgeschlossen, den Heiden gleich geachtet, und fühlten sich ohne Gott, ohne Trost und Hoffnung in der Welt, weil sie sich auch von Jesu, auf den sie gehofft hatten, verlassen glaubten. Das war für fromme Juden ein unerträglicher Zustand. Wie es bei uns Christen heißt: „Nur in Christo ist Heil, und ist kein andrer Name den Menschen gegeben, darinnen selig zu werden, als der Name Jesu," so hieß es bei den Juden, auch bei den Judenchristen: „Nur in Israel ist Heil, und ohne Tempel, Priester, Altar und Opfer kein Anteil am Reich Gottes!" Daß Jesus einen **neuen** Bund gestiftet, in welchem Ja und Amen, Erfüllung und Realität ist, was im alten Bund nur Schatten und Vorbild, Verheißung und Hoffnung war, das begriffen sie nicht. In ihrer Bedrängnis mögen dann viele in Versuchung geraten sein, den Glauben an Jesum aufzugeben und ins ungläubige Judentum zurückzukehren. Vor diesem Schritt warnte sie der herrliche Hebräerbrief, wie es scheint, mit gutem Erfolg, denn als bald nachher das Gericht über das Judenvolk hereinbrach, war doch noch eine Menge von Christen vorhanden, die nach Pella ins Ostjordanland sich retteten, der Mahnung des Herrn eingedenkt. Aber die Gemeinde war zerstört und das Judenchristentum verschwand.

5. **Die Verzögerung der Wiederkunft Christi war wohl der Hauptgrund ihres Rückfalls ins Judentum.** Sie glaubten an das Kommen des Herrn; und dieser Glaube war kein Aberglaube und keine Schwärmerei: sie hatten ihn von den Aposteln. Nun litten

sie Verfolgung. Einmal, nach des Stephanus Tod, kamen sie in schlimme Bedrängnis; sie erfuhren den Raub ihrer Habe und die Vertreibung aus Jerusalem. Auch Gefängnis und Schläge mußten sie erdulden; und Christus **ließ das geschehen** und nahm sich seiner Bekenner nicht an! Jahrzehnte vergingen und Christus ließ sie harren. Nun ist das Warten sehr langweilig und ermüdend. Das Warten auf den Herrn war eine ernste Probe des Glaubens. Da mögen Reden geführt worden sein, wie wir sie 2. Petri 3, 3 lesen: „Wo bleibt denn seine verheißene Wiederkunft? Seitdem die Väter entschlafen sind, bleibt ja doch alles so, wie es von Anfang der Schöpfung gewesen ist." Im Glauben, von Jesu im Stich gelassen zu sein, werden manche gemeint haben, sie müßten eines andern warten.

Wir aber danken Gott, daß es nicht nach Juden Begriffen ging. Denn vom Wiederkommen des Messias erwarteten sie nichts anders als die Aufrichtung einer jüdischen Weltherrschaft mit Unterdrückung und Vernichtung der Heiden, wie zu Josuas Zeiten. Allein, Gott hat die Welt geliebt, in Christo mit sich selbst versöhnt. Es war unmöglich, daß der Weltheiland den Juden ihre Wünsche erfüllen konnte. Ja, wenn er es nur mit den Gläubigen unter den Juden zu tun gehabt hätte, wäre er bald gekommen; aber sein Kommen für **alle** Welt war noch lange nicht vorbereitet, wie das von Paulus und Johannes später auch erkannt wurde. Das sehen wir im 2. Thessalonicher Brief und in der Apokalypse. Der Herr kommt, wenn die Bedingungen erfüllt sind; wenn die Welt mit ihren Fürsten zum Gericht reif ist. Weil jene ersten Christen in ihrer jüdischen Beschränktheit in ihrer Erwartung der baldigen Parusie des Herrn sich wirklich getäuscht haben, muß nun diese Hoffnung auch bei sonst gläubigen Christen als Schwärmerei gelten. Nicht nur Johannes, selbst auch Paulus wird von Illusionen nicht frei gesprochen.

EDITORIALS

MILITANT CHRISTIANITY

For some years we have in our editorials made some mention of the great Pastors' Conventions that meet regularly at Columbus, Ohio, in the latter part of January. They are as a rule attended by over one thousand ministers. Each day begins with a devotional service, which is followed by a two-hour discussion in the various committees. The rest of the day is given over to inspirational addresses. A valuable feature is the attention paid to sacred music. The musical director this year was Dr. J. F. Williamson of Ithaca, New York, who believes that the purpose of church music is worship, not entertainment. With a large group of singers, drawn from the Westminster choirs of different cities, he achieved a notable success along the line of his ideals.

However, this year we are not going to report on the addresses we heard, many of which were of a high order. On the platform we missed a man whose church is only a few blocks from Memorial Hall (where the Convention was held). He is one of the leading pastors, if not *the* leading pastor, of Columbus. We decided to stay over until Sunday and go and hear that man. It is Dr. Lichliter of the First Congregational Church, the successor of Washington Gladden.

On Sunday morning, going down East Broad Street (where Lichliter's church is located), we passed a large Catholic church. The sidewalk in front of it was thronged with men who were waiting their turn to attend mass. That sight raised in us feelings of envy—such a spectacle would not be duplicated in front of a Protestant church! We walked on a block or two and entered First Congregational. What a surprise! The auditorium was already filled with worshipers, and they kept coming and coming, until every seat was occupied and men were lined up against the rear wall. What could be the cause of such an en masse attendance? It was no special Sunday or occasion. A member of the church told us it was that way every Sunday. Choir and music were of the ordinary type. It must have been the minister, then. Dr. Lichliter was already in his chair beside the pulpit, a man of fifty or so, with a ruddy countenance but otherwise without any particular marks of personality. He read from the second chapter of second Timothy, and selected the second verse for his text, "Thou therefore endure hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ." The pas-

tor's sermons, so we were informed by the bulletin of the day, had, in the last month grown up around the idea of militancy in religion. The sermon we heard partook of the same character. The apostle Paul was not a military man in the ordinary sense. On the contrary, he was a man of peace and a messenger of the gospel of peace. But nevertheless, there are many references to the soldier's life in his letters. His own life was one where he was at death's door daily, a continual battle, a contest for the highest stakes, a consecration of all his manhood to win the crown. He exhorts Timothy to be a good soldier of Jesus Christ. The militant tone in Paul's life is unmistakable. He approaches death with the consciousness that he had fought a good fight.

So Dr. Lichliter was trying to let the note of militancy resound through his sermon. Some years ago he said we fought a war for what we thought then the highest ideals of justice and civilization. Today we have come to abhor war. But by no means can we afford to let up in our fight against the wrongs of society, or in our devotion to high ideals, or in the measure of our consecration. If we hold our banner high in these respects, if every one in his own calling and circumstances will try to give the best that is in him, his life will be so strenuous, so challenging and even heroic that he will find a moral equivalent for war in the natural struggles of a peace time existence. The speaker dulled the edge of his militancy somewhat when he said some of us might feel urged to take a radical stand and bring upon ourselves hatred, opposition, ostracism. That would be the price a radical had to pay, he said, as long as he brought sufferings on himself only. But he had no right to bring it upon his wife and children, except with their consent. We thought of Luther's battle hymn, "Nehmen sie uns den Leib, Gut, Ehre, kind und Weib, Lass fahren nur dahin." Lichliter's possible radicalism didn't seem radical enough. Our missionaries, let alone the reformers and apostles, do better than that. At one time Lichliter touched on problems discussed at the Pastors' Convention. The question, he said, had been asked there, should a minister preach on unemployment? Various answers had been given. I, he went on, don't preach on it; not because I am afraid but because I have no solution to offer.

Of course, we can't draw far-going inferences from the chance remarks Lichliter made in this sermon.

He read his sermon but read it well, so that the reading interfered little with the effectiveness of the message. It was a well built up discourse, with carefully chosen diction. Even in his prayer his language and thought were chosen with unusual discrimination.

The man has been in his present charge from eleven to twelve years. It was not easy to step into W. Gladden's shoes. He has succeeded wonderfully as far as his success can be guaged by the size of his congregation and his popularity. They are building a large, beautiful, cathedral-like church for him now in one of the most desirable locations on East Broad Street. The sermon we heard didn't seem to be a full explanation of his success. But then when people spend a million for a new church because their minister has made the old one too small, who would want to criticize?

A RABBI ON PRAYER

We had occasion recently to hear a public lecture, by a Jewish rabbi, on the subject of prayer. Since we had just finished Rabbi Silver's book on the "Place of Religion in a Changing World" with its almost total silence on prayer, we were anxious to hear whether this other rabbi, Dr. Louis Wolsey, of Philadelphia, Pa., would do his subject better justice. On arriving at the appointed place we found the hall packed with people, most of them apparently of Jewish extraction. The rabbi, a rather portly man of about sixty, of free and easy platform manners, soon launched into his theme. He began with the prehistoric man, to show the evolution of prayer. Primitive man already proves, he said, the truth of the fact that man is an incurably religious animal. The relics of that early time furnish convincing proof that the race, from the beginning, has felt the need of religion and practised it. In joy and sorrow, in poverty and danger, in the changing cycles of the natural year, man sought the favor of the forces that control their destiny. As by gift-giving we make and keep friends in ordinary intercourse, in the same manner men reached out for the protection of the deity.

But after the lapse of millenniums science came upon the scene. Man learned that a great many things he had tried to obtain by prayer could be had by the use of science; that, instead of the miraculous intervention of divine power, the knowledge and use of nature's forces would produce good crops, would bring healing from disease, prevent the spread of epidemics and make human life richer, happier and progressive.

Has science then made prayer unnecessary? queried the speaker. No, there are still things beyond our control; still aspirations science can't satisfy; questions it will not answer. It is still reasonable to believe in God. There must be reason in, and back of the universe, else there would be anarchy. Our conception of God may have changed but we still need God. Mankind is even today dependent on one greater than itself. Atheism, so claimed the rabbi,

is only a name, there is no real atheism. Even the Russians, who declare religion to be the opium of the people, need a Lenin to worship and a Marx to give them a gospel which they believe in with religious fervor. Every human desire is a prayer, every urge toward a fuller life is a prayer. The prayers of yesterday won't be the prayers of today and tomorrow. Prayer has passed through an evolution, but its essential nature is unchanged. Whenever people come together and pray, it binds them into community, it has a socializing effect. There are also prayers that have the opposite effect. Imprecations are prayers. During the War we cursed the Germans, invoked the thunders of heaven upon our brethren in the flesh. Have we repented of our sins of yesterday? At any rate, we have come to see that our prayers lacked enlightenment and that they burned with a fire not kindled by the hand of God.

Here the speaker stopped, he had reached the limit of his insight and the climax of his oratorical effect. Was his message satisfactory, had he done better than the other rabbi? We can only say that we had a feeling of disappointment. That man is a praying animal; that even the Bolsheviks pray; that man will always pray in some fashion or other, are statements so stale and banal that it wasn't necessary to proclaim them with so much heat and lung power. The speaker was an Israelite and yet he never mentioned the book of psalms, which in time became the prayer-book of all mankind. He never mentioned the men of prayer, nor showed what prayer had done in their lives. He never said a word about the technique of prayer, never indicated with one word how the art of prayer might be learned. Of course, he knew there were all kinds of beliefs and unbelief represented in the audience. Still he had a perfect right to say what prayer meant to him—if it did mean much to him. The leader who introduced the speaker said he hoped a revival of prayer would be the result of the rabbi's address. When the rabbi had ended we were sure that such a hope hadn't the ghost of a chance.

Iſt das Gebet wirkungskräftig nach außen, oder bloß nach innen?

Es mag wohl ſein, daß das Gebet heutzutage vielfach eine verlorene Kunſt genannt werden darf. Selbſt bei den Gebeten, die man in der Oeffentlichkeit hört, hat man das Gefühl, als wenn ihnen Wärme und beſonders „Salbung" (mit dem Geiſt) nur zu häufig fehle. Zum Teil kommt das von der materialiſtiſchen Zeitſtrömung, infolge deren „Sorgen, Reichtum und Wolluſt" dem Gebetsgeiſt den Odem entziehen; zum Teil auch mag die Wiſſen-

schaft nicht ohne Schuld sein, die dem Gebet Schranken zieht, die früher nicht so anerkannt waren. Jedoch gebe man sich nicht dem Irrtum hin, als wenn der Zweifel an der Allwirksamkeit des Gebetes erst von heute wäre. Schreiber dieses erinnert sich noch deutlich eines Gespräches, das er vor vielen Jahren über diesen Gegenstand mit einem älteren Bruder hatte. Hat das Gebet Einfluß auf äußere Umstände oder nicht? war die Frage. Der andre Geistliche, ein Mann von starker Intelligenz, war zweifelhaft in Bezug auf die äußeren Umstände, aber, fügte er hinzu, der **psychologische Einfluß** des Gebets (auf den Betenden selbst) ist jedenfalls hoch einzuschätzen. Auch Mr. Moody († 1893), der große Evangelist, hat sich darüber ausgesprochen. Er war aber ganz entschieden der Meinung, daß das Gebet auch objektive Wirkungen zur Folge habe. Er machte sich über die lustig, welche dem Christen sagen: „Keep on praying, it won't help, but it is a **healthy exercise**!" Er wies auf die Verheißungen der Schrift hin, welche nicht nur innere Segnungen in Aussicht stellen, sondern sich auch auf äußere Umstände selbst beziehen.

Aber seitdem ist doch sehr viel Wasser den Berg hinuntergelaufen, und es läßt sich nicht leugnen, daß auch fromme Leute sich neuerer Einsicht über das Gebet nicht verschließen.

Letztes Jahr ist unser Land von einer schrecklichen Dürre heimgesucht worden. So anhaltend war das trockene Wetter, daß noch vor zwei Wochen (anfangs März) eine Farmerfrau uns bei einem Besuch mitteilte, daß ihre Leute Wasser für den täglichen Bedarf von weither holen müßten. Und wie viele Hunderttausende waren auf öffentliche und private Mildtätigkeit angewiesen, nur um ihr Leben zu fristen. Sicherlich hat es an Gebet um Regen nicht gefehlt, oder sollen wir sagen: die Leute erwarten vom Gebet keinen Einfluß aufs Wetter mehr, darum haben sie nicht gebetet? Jedenfalls ist kein Regen gekommen, bis alles vertrocknet war.

Hilft denn Gott, der Herr, den Menschen nicht mehr, wenn sie in Not sind? Sind denn seine Verheißungen veraltet? „Rufe mich an in der Not . . . erretten . . ." Der Herr Jesus selbst war doch ein großer Beter, und seine Worte übers Gebet scheinen doch auch äußere Umstände und Schwierigkeiten in sich zu schließen: „So ihr Glauben habt . . . Senfkorn, sprechet zu diesem Berg: Hebe dich hinweg! und es wird geschehen." Und seine Jünger später beteten, und Petrus wurde aus dem Gefängnis befreit. Jakobus hält uns das Beispiel des Elias vor, welcher „war ein Mensch wie wir, und doch betete er und es kam eine Teurung, und er betete wieder und der Regen fiel vom Himmel in Strömen."

Kürzlich berichtete die Zeitung von einem weitberühmten Prediger, der die Meinung geäußert hatte, daß wir anders beten müß-

ten als unsre geistlichen Vorfahren, die Propheten eingeschlossen. Wir kennten die Naturgesetze und wüßten, daß Gott nicht willkürlich in sie eingreifen könnte wegen des Gebetes eines unwissenden, wenn auch gläubigen, Menschen. Das Gebet sei eine **psychologische** Erfahrung, **nicht** eine **theologische.** Sein Einfluß erstrecke sich auf den betenden Menschen, nicht auf Gott. Es handle sich bei dem Gebet wesentlich darum, die eigene Seele mit Geduld, Zuversicht, Gehorsam zu erfüllen. Gelänge das, so habe das Gebet uns alles geleistet, was wir erwarten könnten.

Diesem Mann konnten wir doch nicht zustimmen. Wir dachten an A. H. Francke, den großen Waisenvater von Halle, unter dessen Standbild in den Franckeschen Stiftungen bloß steht: **Er traute Gott,** und dessen Glaube und Gebet so sichtlich von Gott auch durch äußere Erfolge gesegnet wurde. Auch an Georg Müller von Bristol, einen andern großen Waisenfreund, der mit 83 Jahren auf einer Versammlung in Essen (Westfalen) die Aeußerung tat: Seit 60 Jahre habe ich meinem Gott vertraut, und er hat mich nie im Stich gelassen (bezüglich der äußeren Mittel).

Die Wirkungen des Gebets sind oft auch in der Gestaltung der äußeren Umstände zu spüren. Manche haben in ihm ein Heilmittel für Krankheiten gefunden. Es handelt sich dabei aber nicht um ein Durchbrechen der Naturgesetze. Christus allerdings gebietet dem Sturm, aber wir lesen nichts derartiges von seinen Jüngern. Der Hauptzweck des Gebets ist der Einfluß auf das innere Leben, insofern ist es eine psychologische Erfahrung. Aber es bringt uns in innigste Gemeinschaft mit Gott, und wir lernen ihn dadurch besser kennen. So können wir es auch eine theologische Erfahrung nennen. Wir haben es beim Gebet mit Gott zu tun, nicht bloß mit uns selbst. Es ist nicht eine Autosuggestion, sondern ein Zwiegespräch mit Gott. Auf seinen höchsten Stufen bringt es davon unmittelbare und unumstößliche Gewißheit. Sollte denn nun der so gesuchte und gefundene Gott nicht dann mit seiner Menschheit gnädig walten können, ohne seine eigenen Gesetze zu durchbrechen?

The Christian World

Morgan the Magnificent

By Clinton Rogers Woodruff

"Il Magnifico, the modern Lorenzo de Medici." So J. Pierpont Morgan was called in Italy during his lifetime and so John K. Winkler entitles his lively and highly entertaining life of that remarkable man.[1] Morgan had more nicknames than anyone of recent times. At school in the beginning he was called "Pip" because his fellow pupils could not understand or pronounce "John Pierpont." Later in life he was dubbed "Pierpontifex Maximus" and the list of other designations, not to say at times objurgations, is a long one.

Written in a clever, journalistic style, we have what may be fairly called a sympathetic account of one of the biggest figures in the nineteenth century. There is nothing particularly new in this account, but we are told in a terse, graphic way the leading facts about one of America's great bankers, a "master financier," who used his great power and influence, not merely to enrich himself, but to help the corporations and those who had invested in their securities in which he was interested, and in times of crisis to help the country as a whole.

This is neither a definitive nor a depreciatory biography, just a lively, intimate account of a man who in his day and generation used his truly great abilities to create a great fortune, a great business, a great collection of arts, and (save in one instance) to build and rebuilt great corporations. Likewise he was for more than a generation an outstanding figure both in art circles and in the Church, to which he was seriously and sincerely attached. We behold in this book not merely the financial overlord with an uneasy itch for power, but "the creator of a new industrial day in America, the patron of art, the imperious anarch who in manners and morals was a law unto himself." Competing in interest with Morgan himself are the other important figures that move through the pages: James J. Hill, E. H. Harriman, Jacob Schiff, Andrew Carnegie, Charles M. Schwab, and to mention many others.

He was a big man among big men, but rather as a Churchman and as a collector of ecclesiastical art that I prefer to write of him at this time.

Morgan's religion Winkler defines as "a strange, depthful thing." It was the strongest impellent in his nature; and undoubtedly was linked with occasional waves of melancholia which swept over him. However, his religion, like everything else, was a private possession not to be shared with his fellowmen. Deep within Morgan burned

---

[1] New York: The Vanguard Press. $3.50.

the zealous doctrines of the old Puritan divines. From earliest childhood he had been taught that man comes into the world a sinner; and that only a favored few can escape the hell fire to which our sphere is doomed.

The only hope of salvation, Morgan believed, lay in the doctrine of the Atonement. All his life he wavered not an inch from the beliefs of his boyhood. The first article of his will contains this remarkable declaration:

"I commit my soul into the hands of my Saviour, in full confidence that, having redeemed it and washed it in His most precious blood. He will present it fautless before the throne of my Heavenly Father; and I entreat my children to maintain and defend, at all hazard, and at any cost of personal sacrifice, the blessed doctrine of the complete atonement for sin through the blood of Jesus Christ, once offered, and through that alone."

Morgan was a devoted Churchman. Though no scholar, and never a deeply read man, he was thoroughly conversant with the history of the American Church. It was one of the curious anomalies of his nature that he could revel in gatherings of ecclesiastics where serious discussions of dogma and Church law consumed the sessions. For decades he fairly dominated the American Church. He acquired the position, almost, of a lay Pope, and probably had as much influence in Church affairs as any member of the House of Bishops. At least this is the impression his Church life and activities make on his biographer.

For twenty-four years Dr. W. S. Rainsford, a picturesque Cambridge University Irishman, was rector of Mr. Morgan's church—St. George's on Stuyvesant Square in lower New York. Though total opposites in social outlook—Dr. Rainsford believed in "salvation by human touch"—these powerful individualists were irresistibly drawn to each other. During the period of his rectorate, Dr. Rainsford breakfasted each Monday with Mr. Morgan, who was his senior warden, and perhaps drew closer to him than any other. "The autocrat of the breakfast table confided in Rainsford as he did in few."

When Dr. Rainsford took over St. George's in 1883 the church was dying of dry rot. He made St. George's a free church, and welcomed the teeming masses of the East Side. Preaching a religion of broad humanitarianism, almost of socialization, Dr. Rainsford restored St. George's ancient glory. Morgan grumbled at the revolutionary creed of the new voice in the pulpit, but recognized in the rector a man who got results, and so backed him to the limit.

Of Mr. Morgan's religion Dr. Rainsford said:

"His beliefs were to him precious heirlooms. He bowed before them as the Russian bows to the 'ikon' before he salutes the master of the house. The Evangelical 'Plan of Salvation' was to him what the Ark of the Covenant was to ancient Judaism. Of how that 'plan' grew, what other earlier plans were merged in it, he knew nothing. So Mr. Morgan had the peace and power of religious assurance, while

the very nature of his assurance precluded in him the possibility of spiritual development. His religion was a talent to be wrapped in its own napkin and venerated in the secret place of his soul; laid aside in safe disuse, rather than passed from man to man in life's great barter."

Mr. Winkler tells us that Morgan was a warm man, emotional at core. When fawning and flattery began to take inevitable effect, he lived constantly in a false environment. Often this led to periods of deep despondency. He withdrew unto himself. Only occasionally were the depths of his nature stirred. Then he cried aloud for help and reached for the sympathy of the small number to whom he gave himself without reserve. One of these rare and revealing moments occurred behind the locked door of a steamship cabin. Here is Mr. Winkler's account of it:

At a meeting of the vestry of St. George's Church, Morgan had, surprisingly, introduced a resolution to reduce the membership of the vestry from eight members and two wardens to six members and two wardens. "This motion had best be passed without debate," said Morgan. The move stunned other members of the vestry and the rector. The latter had planned an expansion of the vestry to take in at least one representative of a flood of new parishioners. Rainsford demanded Morgan's reasons. Reluctantly, Morgan explained: "The rector's responsibility is spiritual. The vestry's part is fiduciary. I do not want the vestry democratized. I want it to remain a body of gentlemen whom I can ask to meet me in my study."

The issue was joined. The battle was fought out until midnight. Morgan lost. Only his own vote sustained his position. Morgan rose and, speaking slowly, said "Rector, I will never sit in this vestry again." He walked out. Next day Rainsford had his written resignation. This the rector acknowledged, but did not submit to the vestry. At breakfast the following Monday Morgan asked: "Have you submitted my resignation?"

"I have not and I will not," responded Rainsford.

"Why not?"

"Because I will not now or ever put you in the position of going back on your pledge to the rector and the vestry of St. George's Church."

"What do you mean?"

"You know what I mean. When I first came to you I came because you gave me your hand and your promise to stand by me in the hard work that lay ahead. I told you I was a radical. I told you I would do all I could to democratize the church. I am only keeping my word. I certainly shall not now, nor at any time, do anything to help you break yours."

Morgan was silent. Three times he and Rainsford breakfasted together with never an allusion to Morgan's resignation. Then Morgan sailed for Europe. His annual departure, by now, was almost a func-

tion. For the first time, Rainsford went to the dock. Morgan saw him and beckoned. The two men entered Morgan's cabin. The financier shut and bolted the door. What happened will never be known. Rainsford will only say: "We never had another falling-out."

When the trustees of the Metropolitan Museum of Art decided to create a permanent memorial to Mr. Morgan, who had been one of its former presidents and greatest benefactors, they placed a golden legend over the doorway of the Wing of Decorative Arts reading, "The Pierpont Morgan Wing." This section of the museum was dedicated to the study of those arts and crafts concerned with the interior decoration of church and home, with the beautifying of the arhitectural elements of such structures, and of the thousand and one things, ecclesiastical and domestic, that go to complete both.

Although this wing contains many objects presented to the Museum by others, a chief glory lies in the Morgan gifts to which the central hall is almost entirely devoted. From the "Pieta" of the Della Robbia school on the left of the entrance and the "Nativity" of Anton Rossellino on the right, the eye is caught up and carried along with an ever-increasing interest and grave delight to the great velvet hanging at the end of the hall embroidered with the papal key and bearing the name "Alexander VII, P.M." This visual progress, however, never goes forward and upward uninterruptedly. For between entrance and rear wall, as *America* has pointed out, there are a hundred and one points of beauty to arrest the eye, to enchant it, to carry to the soul the message of the supreme loveliness of the art of the Catholic Church.

This hall contains on its floor or lower walls nothing that is not of the Catholic Church and Catholic art. With few exceptions, every object in the collection is of the Gothic period although they come from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, when Gothic art was in its decline.

One could write indefinitely of Mr. Morgan as an art collector. Winkler did not rate Morgan as an art connoisseur, but what I have repeated of the Morgan collection in the Metropolitan tells a different story. For one I believe he was as much a genius in this field as in the realm of finance.

It may interest and perhaps surprise my readers to know that his son, the present J. Pierpont Morgan, is likewise an intelligent collector and a friend of Pope Pius XI. The story is told in the *New Yorker*.[2]

Morgan's interest in biblical lore has brought him some unusual associations. He and Pope Pius XI correspond regularly. When the financier is in Rome, he turns as soon as possible from the hustle and bustle of the revivified Mussolinian metropolis and drives to the Vatican. The Pontiff leads the way to an inner den where he and his distinguished guest from overseas sit about informally and discuss Coptic manuscripts!

---

[2] Issue of February 9, 1929. *The Living Church.*

The friendship began when Pope Pius, then Monsignor Ratti, undertook the labor of restoring sixty volumes written in Coptic, or medieval Egyptian script, dating back to the seventh century. Two years before his death Morgan senior—"in Italy he was called admiringly Il Magnifico, the modern Lorenzo de Medici—enlisted the aid of Monsignor Ratti in making legible the tattered pages." "Il Magnifico" had just paid a large sum for them. The unique Coptics were discovered in a dry well attached to the ruined monastery of St. Michael the Archangel in Fayoum, Egypt.

Pope Pius is perhaps the greatest living authority on early Christian documents. He and expert manuscript restorers stiffened the crumbling parchment with gelatin; and the writing so cleared up that nearly all of it can now be read. In 1923, after twelve years of uncertainty, the Pope sent the restored volumes to the younger Morgan. They now occupy cabinets of honor in the Morgan Memorial Library. Ten complete photographic copies of the original volumes have been deposited in the leading museums and libraries of the world; and students of exegesis pore over them, eagerly searching out differing versions of the New Testament.

"Morgan the Magnificent" had vision, surpassing vision, "incredible audacity, sublime self confidence, unqualified courage, amazing vividity of mind and body, and a personality that can only be described as overwhelming."

He did things, Mr. Winkler tells us, that today could not be defended in law or morals, but for his time and generation he played the game fairly. Mr. Morgan had his shortcomings which his biographer describes, but he treats them in true perspective and not in such extravagant proportions as to give a distorted picture.

The Living Church.

Einstein's Cosmic Religion

He has been called an atheist, but Dr. Albert Einstein, eminent Jewish scientist and philosopher, who has attempted to survey the universe and given to the world his theory of relativity, confesses to a profound reverence and awe when he contemplates the cosmic mystery.

He does not believe that God is man made large.

Nor does he believe that there is any such thing as sin in the commonly accepted meaning of that word. But he has a point of view which he says is common to those who, like him, have attempted to plumb the sources of the universe, and have ever been confronted with the secret of its origin.

He names it the "*cosmic religious sense*," and it is the natural result of his research.

So this fifty-one-year-old wizard of four dimensions has achieved a philosophic calm that well might be envied by those who grope in doubt. He is immensely human, an Associated Press dispatch informs us. He likes a joke and he likes to see people happy.

"The most beautiful thing to be found anywhere," he has observed

enthusiastically, "is a face radiant with joy." His own face lights up when he is interested, and especially in his hours of recreation, spent chiefly in rambling over the keys of his grand piano or in playing the violin, of which, though he has never taken lessons, he is a master.

His voice, we read, is rich and melodious, and his bright dark brown eyes accentuate the delicate whiteness of his skin. His curly, grayish hair runs pell-mell backward and upward from the thinker's high brow.

He is not identified with party politics. Humanitarianism, instead, is one of his chief interests. Pacifism is among his favorite topics in discussions with friends. International solidarity, which is already evinced in science, art, finance, and literature, he believes, will in due course become strong enough to eliminate war.

From which it will be seen that he is very much like the rest of us, for all that he lives mostly among the clouds and ponders on things which can not be exprest in a mathematical formula. One of these is religion.

Briefly, in an article in the New York *Times Magazine*, he traces its rise.

Religion, he says, in effect, is the response to man's inherent needs. Among primitive people it developed into the "religion of fear"—fear of hunger, of wild animals, of illness and death showing itself in deeds and sacrifices intended to secure the protective favor of an anthropomorphic, or manlike, divinity.

Next came the religion which has its source in the social feelings of human beings—in the longing for guidance, love, comfort by a Providence who protects, decides, rewards and punishes. "This," he says, "is the social or moral idea of God." But all religions, he holds, are mixed forms, though the moral element rules in the higher levels of social life. "Common to these types is the anthropomorphic character of the idea of God."

To these two forms Dr. Einstein adds a third, which exceptionally gifted individuals may attain, though traces of it are found in some who have never made researches in the universe, as the Psalmist David and the Prophets. And it is this that, to repeat, he calls the "cosmic religious sense." He describes it thus:

"The religious geniuses of all times have been distinguished by this cosmic religious sense, which recognizes neither dogmas nor God made in man's image.

"Consequently, there can not be a church whose chief doctrines are based on the cosmic religious experience.

"It comes about, therefore, that we find precisely among *the heretics* of all ages men who *were inspired* by this highest *religious experience;* often they appeared to their contemporaries as atheists, but sometimes also as saints.

"Viewed from this angle, men like Democritus, Francis of Assisi, and Spinoza are near to one another.

"How can this cosmic religious experience be communicated from

man to man, if it can not lead to a definite conception of God or to a theology?

"It seems to me that the most important function of art and of science is to arouse and keep alive this feeling in those who are receptive.

"Thus we reach an interpretation of the relation of science to religion which is very different from the customary view.

"From the study of history, one is inclined to regard religion and science as irreconcilable antagonists, and this for a reason that is very easily seen.

"For any one who is pervaded with the sense of causal law in all that happens, who accepts in real earnest the assumption of causality, the idea of a Being who interferes with the sequence of events in the world is absolutely impossible.

"Neither the religion of fear nor the social-moral religion can have any hold on him.

"A God who rewards and punishes is for him unthinkable, because man acts in accordance with an inner and outer necessity, and would, in the eyes of God, be as *little responsible* as an *inanimate object* is for the movements which it makes."

In consequence, science has been accused of undermining morals—but wrongly, insists Dr. Einstein. For, he holds:

"The *ethical behavior* of man is better based on sympathy, education, and social relationships, and *requires no support from religion.*

"Man's plight would, indeed, be sad if he had to be kept in order through fear of punishment and hope of reward after death.

"It is, therefore, quite natural that the churches have always fought against science and have persecuted its supporters.

"But, on the other hand, I assert that the cosmic religious experience is the strongest and the noblest driving force behind scientific research. No one who does not appreciate the terrific exertions, and, above all, the devotion without which pioneer creations in scientific thought can not come into being, can judge the strength of the feeling out of which alone such work, turned away as it is from immediate practical life, can grow.

"What a deep faith in the rationality of the structure of the world and what a longing to understand even a small glimpse of the reason revealed in the world there must have been in Kepler and Newton to enable them to unravel the mechanism of the heaven in long years of lonely work!

"Any one who only knows scientific research in its practical applications may easily come to a wrong interpretation of the state of mind of the men who, surrounded by skeptical contemporaries, have shown the way to kindred spirits scattered over all countries in all centuries.

"Only those who have dedicated their lives to similar ends can have a living conception of the inspiration which gave these men the power to remain loyal to their purpose.

"It is the cosmic religious sense which grants this power.

"A contemporary has rightly said that *the only deeply religious* people of our largely materialistic age are the *earnest men* of *research.*"

Dr. Einstein's view-point does not sound like atheism, comments Rabbi Solomon B. Freehof of Chicago. Rather, says Rabbi Freehof, as his address to the Free Synagogue in Carnegie Hall, New York, is quoted in the New York *Herald Tribune:*

"His idea of the universe is close to religiousness, but his point of view is not quite religious, because religion, besides believing in the mystery of the universe, believes that there is a mystic bond in some way uniting us to the infinite.

"But he has the new reverential and confident relationship to the universe that is typical of science in these days, and will be the cause of a new religious attitude toward the world."

But the argument that there is no such thing as sin, says Dr. Harry F. Ward of the Union Theological Seminary in New York, is not supported by facts, but merely by denying the existence of God. "Man," he says, as his sermon at the James Memorial Chapel is quoted in *The Times,* "is therefore relieved of any of the pains, penalties, and fears of sin, since without a God there can be no divine decrees to be broken."

"The trouble," thinks Dr. Ward, "lies in dealing with sin only as a theological definition, in having no perception of the overtones of sin which go far beyond both morals and laws. The great scientist should realize that there is no science which does not include these overtones among its facts. To ignore them is to sin against the very spirit of truth itself.—*Literary Digest.*

What Is a Mystic?

By the Rev. Desmond Morse-Boycott

What is mysticism, and who are, and were, the mystics? The very word "mysticism" conveys a sense of mystery. It comes from the same Greek root. Yet it is wrong to suppose that mysticism is a habit of mind or soul acquired by rare persons who live mainly in the clouds. It is an outlook on life and an attitude to life. Sometimes the simplest souls are mystics without knowing what mysticism is. All religious persons are mystics to a certain extent, for mysticism is the opposite of materialism. It sees life as a thoroughfare, not a terminus.

A simple definition of mysticism has been made by Rudolf Otto, in his *Das Heilige.* It is a hushed, trembling, palpitant response of the human soul in the presence of august, majestic, mysterious, awe-inspiring realities, which produce a consciousness of what he calls the "numinous." His word is from the Latin *numen,* and stands for anything that transcends the finite, the known, the naturalistic, and the describable, and which moves us with awe.

A "numinous" experience "is an original capacity of the total self, and is as inexplicable in terms of anything else as is appreciation of beauty, or the love of music, or the capacity for mathematics, or the sense of moral obligation, or the necessity we feel to presuppose a cause for an effect. All these unique traits in us defy analysis. They belong to our 'deeper nature' as persons. They can no more be 'explained' than we can explain that peculiar quality which we call the taste of 'sweetness,' or the color of 'redness.' You either have it or you do not have it, and if you do not have it, then there is no use arguing. . . . If nothing ever stirs a person's soul with hushed awe, if nothing ever makes him vibrant and palpitant because he feels himself in the presence of the inbreaking of the Divine, the 'numinous,' then there is no way to make that person comprehend what we mean by the essential aspect of religion."

All that is rather terrifying to the inquiring person who wants to know more about mysticism, until one realizes that there are few, very few, whose souls are not sometimes hushed with awe, vibrant and palpitant. The soft notes of *Sun of my soul*, sung by boyish voices and echoing over the fragrant countryside as shadows fall (as I have heard it), can induce this "numinous" state.

Mysticism is a chiming within the soul, a light that breaks in mysteriously and unannounced, a turning of the soul toward God. It would seem to be a faculty of the soul which comes into play unawares. It is more than sentiment, though sentiment may awaken it. It is more than prayer, for it is a state of prayer.

It is not infrequently brought into discredit because mystics who have, or claim to have, startling experiences of the soul, are diseased. Mysticism has been condemned as a form of disease. No one, however, who looks into the lives of the great mystics—St. Paul, St. Teresa, St. John of the Cross, the Lady Julian of Norwich, for instance—can draw any such conclusion. St. Paul had a "thorn in the flesh," which may have been epilepsy, but there is no trace of a diseased mind in any of his writings. Therein he describes some of his mystical experiences (which are not usually experienced by the average mystic-in-the-street). He was caught up to the seventh heaven, and heard unspeakable words which it was not lawful for him to repeat. But time and again one notices that the mystics were sane, practical men and women of affairs. St. Paul at one moment is rapt in ecstasy; at the next he is making tents, or disentangling matrimonial affairs, or discussing women's dress. (But perhaps that was a mystical affair!) St. Teresa, the most famous of women mystics, was always "on the spot." Unlike many of her kind she was fastidious in person and loved to be clean. Describing mystical experience she once wrote:

"Truly, I know not what I write! All I know is that as the bullet goes from the arquebus when the fire touches it, so in one instant, without noise, yet so evidently that it cannot be fancy, the spirit is torn forth. And when it returns to itself, it is with great pain. For the soul has been in a region very different from that in which we live; and has seen another light, not like the light of this world; and

in one moment has learned more a thousand times than ever could be learned by the power of the imagination or by the labor of thought."

Then comes practical common sense:

"On no account let the soul which has received these favors imagine that she may fly away altogether from things corporeal, or forego the usual spiritual exercises or despise her companions. . . . If anyone tells me that she spends her whole time in prayer and ecstasy, I suspect her very much, and doubt it can be as she says."

Mysticism, then, is a state of many stages. It may be a simple "uplift" of the soul or the ecstacy of a saint. It is a profound belief that: "Truth can be found by other and by better ways than by faultless reasoning and process of induction." As Helen Hester Colvill says, in her life of St. Teresa:

"The Mystic stands an unfaltering witness to the presence around and among us of unseen influences, of higher powers, of eternities and infinities which include ourselves and shape our souls. His error is not that in his First Principles he acknowledges a mystery and its potency, then builds up a system of thought ignoring it. Rather he makes himself so familiar with the mystery that he robs it of its mysteriousness; and finding the kingdom of heaven within, he forgets that it is also high so that he may not attain unto it."

This strange experience of contact with the "beyond" is not merely the esoteric possession of those whose lives are devoted to religious exercises, but of those whose way is cast along perilous paths of human endeavor in the active sphere. Sir Ernest Shackleton has recorded how his ship was lost in an ice jam in the Antarctic. He and his men floated on the ice for eight months, at last took to their boats and landed on Elephant Island. With five companions he made his way, in a small boat, 800 miles across a terrible sea to South Georgia. They landed on the wrong side. With two of the men he crossed a mountain range covered with glacier ice. He says:

"I know that during that long and racking march of thirty-six hours over the unnamed mountains and glaciers of South Georgia, *it seemed to me often that we were four, not three.* I said nothing to my companions on this point, but afterwards Worsley said to me, 'Boss, I had a curious feeling on the march that there was another person with us.' Crean (the third man) confessed to the same idea. One feels the dearth of human words, the roughness of mortal speech in trying to describe things intangible, but a record of our journey would be incomplete without a reference to a subject very near to our hearts."

The usual type of mystic has been solitary, and it is sometimes said that solitary mysticism is not the highest type. It is clearly the normal type. The solitary mystic, individualistic in type, seems to have flourished in the Christian Church through the inspiration of St. Augustine, whose mysticism was more intellectual than emotional. "Alone with the alone" is its keynote. It produced many beautiful lives. St. Bernard of Clairvaux (1091-1153) was one of them. He will be remembered as the inspirer of the tragic Second Crusade. His ex-

quisite hymn, *Jesu, dulcis memoria*, will identify him to us at once. Its first words are:

Jesus, the very thought of Thee
With sweetness fills the breast;
But sweeter far Thy face to see,
And in Thy presence rest.

From the thirteenth century there was an increased tendency to group mysticism, the most familiar to us being the Friends of God and the Brethren of the Common Life. This movement produced a beautiful literature, among which the *Imitation of Christ*, supposed to have been written by à Kempis. The Society of Friends, founded by George Fox, better known as the Quakers, is a culmination of that tendency in mysticism which had emphasized lay region and the fact that "God directly teaches the responsive soul, and that experience of God is the essential mark of Christian life."

Mysticism, then, is a "larger life." Whittier expresses this in his words:

So sometimes comes to soul and sense
The feeling which is evidence,
That near about us lies
The realm of spiritual mysteries.
The sphere of the supernal powers
Impinges on this world of ours.

The Living Church.

Book Review

NOTE—*Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.*
(When ordering books, please mention this Magazine.)

Authority In Religion, by *Harold Anson* (author of "A Practical Faith", "Spiritual Healing"). The Century Company, New York and London, 1929, 197 pages.

Many proclaim today that in religion man will not listen to any external authority any more, not to the church, or the creeds of the church or even the letter of the Bible. Religion must win recognition of its claim by the fruits it produces in the life of those who profess it. With this position the author of this book largely agrees. He is not opposed to theology; every minister ought to have the desire to express his beliefs to himself in a way that satisfies his intellect. But he thinks that the future church will be founded more on a common possession of gentleness, wisdom and courage and a practical application of these Christlike virtues than on an agreement as to historical facts (virgin birth, physical resurrection of Christ, etc.). Jesus himself won his disciples by the charm of his personality. His sayings came home to the conscience. They produced an inward sense of certainty. He was so far from enforcing obedience by referring to his divine prerogative that he would rather submit his claims to the judgment of men (what do people say concerning the Son of Man? What do ye say?) He, therefore, acknowledged the right of private judgment, of enlightened private judgment, to be sure. He trusted that the divine voice speaking to everyone who is ready to hear (i. e. the Holy Spirit, according to the writer) would lead them into the truth.

In a chapter on "the Idea of the Infinite" the author says: The highest ideals in human life are those of goodness, truth and beauty. If the universe is at all rational we cannot believe that these ideals are false. That the world of values should have no relation to the world of facts, is an intolerable conclusion. Some perfect and infinite life must be the source as well as the goal of life. And no more adequate description of supreme reality can be given than to say there is the element of personality in it.

As to the origin of man, the writer accepts the theory of evolution. But this evolution must be teleological, having a great purpose back of it. The great results of evolution could not come about by a series of fortunate accidents. He *conceives* of evolution as "prophetic varying constantly toward the production of a whole which the parts at present cannot see or understand." In Christ the evolving purpose of God took a great leap. After the human stage is reached in evolu-

tion, the developing process goes forward by interference with nature. Life with its ills and sufferings is to be taken as a means of producing character. The cross in Christ's life means that a purpose of good is in the world and in the process of achievement through pain and failure and faithful perseverance. The whole creation is groaning and travailing together waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God, i. e. those who share the purpose of God and are willing to cooperate with him.

Chapter IV is devoted to Prayer. Chapter VI treats of immortality. He does not base his hope in immortality on Christ's resurrection. To our mind he weakens the effect of 1 Cor. 15 by a wrong interpretation of Paul's magnificent argument. Immortality conditioned on the character of the individual seems plausible to him. Psychic research as a corroborating evidence of the reality of the spirit world, he discusses quite seriously.

Chapters V and VII deal with the relation of religion to the secular life and of the church to the state. Religion must be incarnated in the life of this world and in society. Writer discusses, historically, the situation in Christ's time when the gospel could not influence the state directly; the medieval dominance of the state by the church; the modern ideal of the free church in a free state, and the English system whereby the king is made the head of the church. This last arrangement he seems to think works out in practice much better than one would think. Church and state are by divine will joined in true marriage and, "what God has joined together let no man put asunder."

The volume is one of the Practical Christianity Series, and, in true English fashion the writer hardly ever leaves the earth of solid fact. His language will be readily understood by everyone. Only once, when discussing the Trinity, did he fail to elucidate to us what he wanted to make clear. Of course, we can't always go with him, but on the whole he is a genial, convincing, sincere guide and no one will regret following him.

Religion In a Changing World, by *Abba Hillel Silver*, D.D., Litt.D. Richard R. Smith, Inc., New York, 1930, 204 pages, $2.00.

The author is a young rabbi, in charge of the Jewish Temple, Cleveland, Ohio. Only thirty-seven years of age, he has already risen to a high place in American Judaism. He has become increasingly identified with the great social movements of our day. He has published two other books before this one, one on "Messianic Speculation in Israel" and one on "The Democratic Impulse in Jewish History." Before the present volume had come out we heard him read the first chapter of it, entitled "the Role of Religion in a Changing World," and were greatly impressed with the vigor of his thought and the nobility of his diction. We were, therefore, agreeably surprised when, a short time afterwards, the "Religious Book Club" sent us the book as the choice of the month. We do not hesitate to say that it came up to the expectations raised by the first chapter.

Rabbi Silver is a Liberal and had been with Liberalism in its onslaught on "the crumbling citadels of orthodoxy." But the battle had swept far beyond the fundamentalist-modernist sector. "The main positions of religion itself, of all religions, are now attacked by the ancient and powerful enemy—materialism and atheism. And this time it is the enemy who is in possession of modern science." By this the writer does not want to say, of course, that science has proved the validity of materialism, but only that, in the opinion of many, faith in God has no substantial basis in human thought any more.

In his contention that religion is one of the deepest and imperishable needs of the human soul, the writer has no recourse to revelation or the Holy Scriptures. He does indeed call the prophets of the Old Testament God-inspired souls, but very much in the sense in which we speak of the inspiration of the great poets. The seers of Israel have proved their trustworthiness by the fact that they had justice on their side. The very wonder of their survival to the twentieth century gives their teachings a pragmatic sanction. Their God was a moral God, vitally interested in human relations, and so they have made it forever impossible to divorce religion from morality.

Silver does not try to demonstrate the truth of religion. With Kant, he believes that God is a postulate of the moral, or practical, reason. The religious man has two convictions which deliver him from the despair of agnosticism. The one is that even in his circumscribed life man can achieve greatly and win a measure of happiness, and the other, that beyond and about his finite life there is the everlasting life of God in whom all human aspirations find their surety and their consummation.

In the world of change religion is to act as a balance wheel for the race when new theories throw it into vast intellectual commotion, and to admonish society not to confound that which is novel with that which is new. To a changing world religion offers the same basic thought-pattern—the reality of God, the reality of personality, of truth, beauty and goodness. "The temper of our age is not religious, nor philosophic nor artistic. It is technologic. It is not given to speculative thought, or meditation, or spiritual questing. It is not hostile to them, only indifferent. Our young people reflect this pervading mood and temper of our civilization. But religion cannot reject them without totally destroying itself. Religion must labor to bring about a change of emphasis in our present day values and interests, and it must wait patiently and confidently for this change."

There is no real conflict between religion and science. Science has made no discovery which upsets God's throne. Their conflicts are only those of trespassing, and resulted from the attempt of the one to poach on the preserves of the other. "The man of faith will not be discomfited either by the venerable character of his own truths or by the spick and span modernity and amazing prolixity of scientific achievements. When the great intoxication with scientific achievement will have passed, and man will discover how much of an aching

void there still remains in his life, and how little mechanism and invention have contributed to his spiritual contentment and harmony of life, he will return humbly and contritely unto 'the well the princes digged, which the nobler of the people delved, with the sceptre and with their staves', his soul thirsting for God, for the living God."

"The methods of science and religion are dissimilar, their immediate objects are not the same. The method of science is observation, that of religion contemplation. Science investigates, religion interprets. One seeks causes, the other ends. Science thinks in terms of history, religion in terms of teleology. One is a survey, the other an outlook."

It does a person good to read this rabbi's book and to see how much we have in common. We are also surprised to observe how valiantly a person can fight for religion who does not believe in Jesus Christ as the most sublime exponent of religion. The rabbi says he doesn't see that there must be a world religion, a universal religion. For any man to claim that his religion must and will prevail over all others, is religious imperialism. His position is that of Nathan, in Lessing's play, let every one be loyal to his own religion and seek to justify it by bearing the true fruits of religion in a God-pleasing life.

The writer has chapters on the Church and Social Justice, the Church and World Peace, Liberalism at the Crossroads, the American Home, Education and the Good Life. In all of these he points out the important service religion and the churches can render. One of the chapters he concludes by giving his creed, the creed he says, by which the untired liberals of all time have lived. Here it is: "We believe in Man, in his slow, ascendant progress, in the autonomy of his spirit and in the primacy of his claims over the claims of all forms of human organization.

We believe in freedom, the fullest measure of freedom compatible with the fullest measure of responsibility. We belfeve in authority—but only in authority sanctiond by reason and consent.

We believe that the only tools of social progress are education, experimentation and cooperation.

We believe that all truth is made manifest through the contact and clash of diverse opinions and that the very motive power of progress is the free exchange of ideas and the exercised privilege of nonconformity.

We believe in tolerance but not in indifference, in enthusiasm but not in fanaticism, in conviction but not in obsessions, in independence but not in isolation, in conflict but not in hate." This creed is rather formal and abstract; intellectual but not religious; emphasizing methods but not stating positive results. If this creed contained all the writer believes it would be disappointing. As has been seen from the digest of his religious convictions given above, religion is to him a summary of the basic spiritual interests and needs of all ages. "It is not a frail bark tossed about on the surface eddies and cross-currents of a day or generation. Heavily freighted with the wisdom of the ages, it must ride the deep channels of time."

Ancient Fires On Modern Altars, by *Adna Wright Leonard* (bishop of M. E. Church). The Abingdon Press 1931, 162 pages, $1.50.

A spiritual appraisal of the present day church, says the writers, is not very encouraging. The old evangelistic zeal is gone. Churches aim to furnish social centers rather than spiritual power plants. The membership is declining. No conversions, is the report of many pastors. At prayer meetings no invitation to the unconverted is given out. All additions come from the Sunday School; the outsiders are not reached. It seems the church has yielded to the spirit of the day. It has come to love wealth and ease. Besides, science has unsettled the faith of many.

The war-time idealism has long evaporated and the total effect of the war has been injurious all over the world. Of course, the picture is not entirely dark. The widespread interest in mysticism shows the hunger for spiritual experience is again manifesting itself. The prevalence of social gospel emphasis is an indication that the church feels the responsibility for a change of the social order towards a more Christian system. Still, in the bishop's opinion, social redemption can only be attained through the regeneration of individual man. Such regeneration is the work of the Holy Spirit. Not until the church experiences a new pentecost will she be able to fulfill her mission to Christianize man and society.

The pulpit in many places reveals the waning power of the church. It has in the radio a competitor, as well as in the Sunday press and in lectures. Many prefer the Sunday School to the preaching service. Yet where the personality of Christ expresses itself through the personality of the preacher, there the pulpit has not lost its attraction. There is a demand for doctrinal preaching. Not for the sectarian sort, but for the preaching of the vital truths, the cross and the resurrection, a supernatural God and a supernatural redemption.

The preaching of the social gospel is overdone. Individual soul-saving is the great task before us. To do this we need the "ancient fire" of the true evangelist, but it must be kindled on modern altars, i. e. must be adapted to modern circumstances. Now the bishop comes to his real subject. He has somewhat revised the old methods of revivalism in the "Preaching Missions" which he has introduced. In these missions he puts the stress on the atmosphere of worship. He uses the old hymns only that have a real spiritual content. The purpose of the music is not entertainment but the cultivation of the worship spirit. He describes his mission plan in detail. As a rule a number of churches unite in the carrying out of his plan. The mission lasts forty days. The time is divided into four periods. It is preceded by a time of preparation when the various committees appointed try to create the favorable atmosphere. The first period is known as "the friendly canvass." Visitors go to the house of every church member of each church trying to get pledges of cooperation. The social period now follows, the period of public evangelism. The preaching is to be doctrinal. Declaration cards are distributed and signed. The signers

remain for the "fellowship hour" (inquiry room). The third period is that of visitation evangelism. Personal workers are selected with great care. Follows the fourth period, the "Spiritual Crusade" in the local church. The preachers explain to their people the meaning of the doctrines in the terms of our day.

On the last Sunday of the entire movement the climax is reached in the celebration of the Lord's Supper in all the respective churches.

Reviewer has no experience along evangelistic work of this sort. But he agrees with the bishop when the latter says that nothing will beat back the tides of unbelief and materialism like a great spiritual movement throughout Christendom. He can also see that in a campaign of evangelism a combination of factors must be considered. The interest, cooperation and time of the lay members must be enlisted. Attention must be paid to all the details of the situation. The experiences of the past must be studied. And in addition to these more external things, the spiritual element demands emphatic attention. The prayer life, the study of the word and spirit-filled preaching are of prime importance. It seems to us that the writer has kept all this well in mind and that therefor revivalistic attempts under the guidance of his instructions ought to have quite a measure of success.

Pioneers of Christian Thought, by *Fred D. Kershner*, Indianapolis, The Bobbs-Merrill Comp. 1930, 373 pages.

The lives and teachings of sixteen leaders in theological thought are here represented. The language is non-technical, and in the selection and the description of the material the attempt is successfully made to reach a more general public.

The series opens with *Philo* whom the author calls the founder of Christian theology. In the writings of the Jewish philosopher not the slightest reference is made to Christianity in any form, but he paved the way for bridging the chasm between Hebrew tradition and the Greek speculative theology. Philo made four important contributions to theology. The first is his emphasis on the divine immanence. He was Jewish to the core in his thinking and never gave up the Jewish idea of divine transcendence. Still he developed a thorough-going belief that God dwells in his universe and is not to be thought as afar off from it. A second characteristic feature is Philo's formulation of the doctrine of the Logos. The Greeks styled the bridge between the infinite God and the finite world the Logos (word, language, creative will, reason). Philo seized the term and identified it with the Wisdom of the Old Testament. Christian interpreters like the author of the fourth gospel amended Philo's views by substituting Jesus for the Old Testament wisdom as the true expression of the divine Word. This became the starting point of the doctrine of the Trinity. The third contribution Philo made is his complete acceptance of the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures. Since he found in the Scriptures passages hard to reconcile with his ethical conceptions, Philo adopted the method of allegorizing the unpleasant details. By the simple process

of discovering a double meaning in the text it was quite easy to iron out the coarsest moral inconsistencies. This is his fourth contribution. For many centuries it became the accepted means of interpreting the scriptures.

Kershner devotes considerable space to a description of the environment in which Philo lived, the city of Alenandria. He points out the combination of Greek scholarship and Egyptian mysticism found there, and the influence of the large Jewish element, in the population (the Old Testament was here translated into Greek: the Septuagint). This first essay is one of the most interesting in the book. Philo's philosophy is understood as the natural product of his particular environment.

The apostle *Paul*, who comes second in this survey of Christian pioneers, was, according to the author, the product of at least four outstanding forces, namely, his Hebrew ancestry and early training; the Greek culture in the city of his birth; the political significance of the Roman Empire and the Roman law; and his conversion to Christianity by the mystical experience at the Damascus gates. While his views concerning women and the ascetic life, his premillenarian opinions and his teaching on the duty of subjection to the state have had tremendous significance in the later history of the church, his chief contributions to Christian theology are as follows: his teaching concerning God; his conception of the person of Christ; his views of the essential nature of man and of the human soul; and his doctrine of immortality. The conviction of a transcendent, personal Deity that runs through all the revelations of the prophets was just as peculiar to Paul as it was to the Pharisees of whom he had once been a devoted member. With them he also shared the belief in divine predestination. It should, however, not be forgotten that for every passage in favor of predestination at least two could be quoted from his letters which can only be understood on the assumption of human freedom. He does not attempt to reconcile these divergences. The practical turn of mind which demanded a clearcut, personal conception of the Deity was not only Jewish but also Roman and Latin. So the doctrine of the divine transcendence, expressed with such force in the writings of Paul, became the corner-stone of the theology of the Latin church.

After his conversion to Christianity Jesus became to him the one who brought salvation from sin and the blessed hope of immortality. Jesus was Lord, that is, his word, will and way were supremely authoritative. The Lordship of Jesus, understood not in a metaphysical or theological but always in a supremely practical sense, was the key-note of Paul's preaching.

Paul's own experience of sin was so overwhelming that he came to have a lasting conviction that only divine grace would save man from it. If he, Paul, who had been careful to observe the law from his youth, could become a persecutor of Christ and the Christians, then human nature must indeed be totally depraved and only a miracle of divine mercy could redeem it.

It will be observed that Kerschner's account of Paul's Christology and Soteriology, i. e. of the savior's person and work of salvation, is rather incomplete. He gives us nothing about the atonement, about Christ's suffering for us, of Christ's righteousness becoming ours, of God's reconciling the world unto himself in Christ, and so forth. Justification by faith, so central in Paul's teaching and so important in the development of the great Reformers, is hardly as much as mentioned. Equally unsatisfactory is the author's account of Paul's teaching on immortality. He says, Paul accepted the Platonic doctrine of the natural immortality of the human spirit and he regarded the resurrection of Jesus as a demonstration of a fact which already existed but which had hitherto been only inadequately proved. Nothing could be further from the real facts. Paul, in 1 Cor. 15 (the chapter the writer has in view in this connection) doesn't speak of the immortality of the soul at all. He speaks of the resurrection of the body and bases our own hopes of resurrection on the resurrection of Jesus. That the soul is immortal was no doubt to Paul a matter of course, he never wasted a line in proving that. Christian witnesses, Paul himself included, had seen Jesus alive. Under the Spirit's enlightenment they saw in his resurrection the consummation of his work. He was the first fruit of them that slept, in him all his believers should be made alive. First, naturally, comes the new life of the Spirit. "But if the spirit of him that raised Christ from the dead be in you he will also quicken your mortal bodies by his spirit that dwelleth in you". A spiritualized body is the ultimate hope of the Christian. The writer says in conclusion: "By virtue of his Jewish inheritance and his Roman citizenship Paul formulated his ideas in terms which became peculiarly appealing to the Latin type of mind. Hence Paul is the real patron saint of the Western World. St. Paul was the real founder of the Western church and of the Western type of theology. But it was not until the appearance of Augustine that Paul came to occupy the preeminent position in the history of theology which he was destined to maintain for so many centuries."

The reader will be surprised to note that the author introduces as the third "Pioneer in Christian Thought" the Gnostic Marcion from Pontus. In the post-apostolic era of Christianity Gnosticism occupied about the same position in the development of thought as does Evolution today. But it soon ran its course and was fought by orthodoxy so bitterly that of all its literature hardly any original trace has remained. We know it only from the writings of its enemies. Tertullian probably surpassed all others in the vehemence of his anti-gnostic utterances. The writer gives a specimen from Tertullian's writings, which indeed breathes an almost insane hatred of the man from Pontus.

The problems the Gnostics tried to solve were the origin and nature of evil; the peculiar ethical standards of the Old Testament; the sufferings and death of Christ; and the method of redemption. It seemed to them unbelievable that the God of the Old Testament who had the Israelites slaughter the Canaanites could be the God of Jesus Christ, or that the Old Testament which contained and sanctioned so

many cruel acts could be the result of a divine revelation. So they resorted to a dualistic philosophy to deliver the real God from responsibility for the evil in the world. The "demiurge" (architect of the world) formed the world and man out of the eternal matter. There is in them a mixture of good and evil. The good element is hungry for salvation. This salvation was wrought by Jesus Christ. The powers of evil triumphed temporarily on Calvary, but the true God, represented by Jesus, won the victory in the hour of resurrection. The process of redemption is a climb upward in fellowship with Jesus through the circles of the aeons to the throne of eternal goodness and truth.

Marcion, in his opposition to the Old Testament hit upon the idea of giving the New Testament writings the same authoritative standing the Old Testament had had. To him we owe the first New Testament canon. His first edition of the New Testament included ten letters of Paul and the gospel of Luke. "The orthodox party could not afford to yield the New Testament field to Marcion. Other books were added to the eleven originally suggested, and in the course of two centuries our present canon became fairly well established."

To Marcion and his heresy we owe another important development. When he came to Rome his teaching soon became the center of orthodox attack. He himself was excommunicated and the Church, in self-protection from his teachings, composed the Old Roman Symbol, the nucleus of the later Apostles' Creed. The precise character of the Old Roman Symbol cannot be determined but it certainly must have had the "challenging expression of monism": I believe in God the father almighty, maker of heaven and earth.

The writer's judgment of Marcion is rather favorable. Following the great Harnack, who expended so much love and study on Marcion, he says: "Marcion stood for a certain ethical idealism which was superior to the more subtle philosophy of his opponents. He wanted to establish the goodness of God, no matter at what cost. If his teachings had prevailed there would have been no autos da fe, no Inquisition, no burning of heretics by either Catholics or Protestants. It was the triumph of the imperialistic God of Tertullian and Augustine which led to most of the later horrors in the history of the church. As Marcion saw all too clearly, no human being will ever rise to a higher moral level than the ethical plane of the Deity which he worships."

After Marcion the author discusses Origen, Athanasius and Theodore of Mopsuestia (the "most modern of all the ancient theologians"). Then he takes up *Augustine*. It is not necessary for us to go into detail about the life and influence of this great man. He is doubtless the best known of all the fathers of the church. Kershner does not seem to admire him much. He says of him: "In all the course of human history we find no defender of imperialism so thorough-going as the real founder of Latin theology. Not only does he advocate the idea that Deity is a species of super-Emperor sitting above the clouds and possessing the power of the Caesars magnified to an infinite degree, but he insists that the one outstanding sin of sins is to

refuse the most unquestioning and slavish homage to the universal Ruler of the world. He fairly grovels in the dust before the Almighty in page after page of his Confessions." He quotes a few paragraphs from the introduction of this famous work and then says: "So it goes on, ad infinitum and ad nauseam. . . . No one can read his works with anything approaching the scientific attitude and escape the conviction that we have to do here with something that is distinctively abnormal and pathological." Worse than this: "Whether the author of the Confessions was a Masochist (sexual perversion where one likes to be treated cruelly by one of the opposite sex. Dictionary) or not may well be a subject for further investigation (!). Certainly he has the Masochistic attitude, not only in his excessive groveling . . . but also in the strange delight which he appears to take in recounting the tortures of eternal damnation. To assume a certain degree of mental perversion is perhaps the best explanation one can give for that strange juxtaposition of love and cruelty which one finds so constantly in the writings of the great theologian". Referring to the controversy with Pelagius (for whom Kershner has considerable liking) he says: "Technically the Roman theologian won but in actuality he lost. Catholics and Protestants are semi-Pelagians today with few exceptions, although they do not like to wear the name".

Again later on we read: "Anything more lurid, cruel or diabolic than he has pictured in the 17th book of the "City of God" it is impossible to conceive. In this matter he set the pace for all succeeding generations. When we read the history of the Middle Ages, with its farrago of autos da fe, torture chambers, burnings at the stake, breaking on the wheel, and all the hideous nightmares which nominally Christian peoples permitted to flourish in their midst we can understand that these things are only faint imitations on the part of human beings of the divine hell-fire of Augustine. Professor Workman puts the situation very mildly when he says that for a thousand years the dark shadow of Augustine was cast across the church."

Kershner is very hard on Augustine. He, the Liberal, has no affinity for the orthodox, nor for imperialism of any kind, nor for any who curtail human freedom or doubt the power of reason. There follow in the book Anselm, Abelard, (the most interesting part of the sketch is Abelard's ill-fated romance with Heloise) *Aquinas*. The author says here: "To be acquainted with the Summa Theologiae (Aquinas' chief opus) is to possess the key to the understanding of the Middle Ages. A knowledge of the works of Aquinas is an indispensable requirement for the proper understanding of the "Divine Comedy". Then he launches upon a fascinating description of the life and works of Dante.

With *Erasmus* we enter into the Reformation era. *Luther* and Calvin are naturally the next leaders. They are followed in the book by *Arminius*. Schleiermacher and Ritschl conclude the review.

One ought not only to read this book but to own it, so that from time to time one can take it down and read a few chapters. One may not share the theological position of the writer nor agree with his

views on many things. Still the book is interestingly written, easy to read, not burdened with too much of technical or speculative material. Besides it always shows the man in his environment and so makes him live before us. A most creditable work of theological biography. The other day we asked in the Public Library, Is there any such book as a Who's Who in theology? No, was the answer. Kershner has given us a Who's Who? as far as the leaders are concerned.

Albert Schweitzer, The Man and His Work, by *John Dickinson Regester* (Professor of Philosophy, College of Puget Sound). The Abingdon Press, 1931, 145 pages, $1.50.

When Dr. O. Dibelius was here in 1921, we heard him, at one time, speak words of high admiration about Albert Sweitzer, the man who, he said, was not only a theologian of high repute, a physician and a missionary, but also an organist and a Bach-interpreter of the foremost rank. Most of us knew of him only as a left-wing higher critic, on account of his radical book on the "Quest of the Historical Jesus". Ten years have elapsed since then without bringing us much more light on the man, and it was a welcome surprise when the Abingdon Press recently sent us the above book. In it the author attempts to give us an appreciative interpretation of Schweitzer's personality and work.

Schweitzer was born in 1875 in Upper Alsace, the son of a minister. The boy's understanding of music and his love for the organ, especially, early manifested itself. He passed through the ordinary course of "gymnasium" and university training. The book tells us only that after taking the state examination in theology, he spent a year of study at the Sorbonne, Paris, and at the university of Berlin. At the close of this year he received the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Soon he began to publish books. One of the first was "From Reimarus to Wrede" (in the English translation "The Quest of the Historical Jesus"). Modern Theology had tried to find in Jesus the source and foundation of our present ethical views. Schweitzer examined the New Testament as well as the attempts of liberal theology along this line. The liberal theologians had divested the Jesus of the New Testament of his deity as understood in the old sense and had left him only the rank of a prophet, the greatest of the line, who revealed the will of God fully and authoritatively. They had eliminated the eschatological element from his message as a contribution from his age and biographers. He now became the ethical teacher and inspiration to his followers. What he had formerly been to the individual was now applied to society. The "kingdom of God" that he had preached became the watchword of a new period.

Schweitzer, himself a Liberal of the Liberals, comes to entirely opposite conclusions. The eschatological view-point was dominant in Jesus. He expected the heavenly kingdom at once. In this kingdom of the future he was to be the Messiah. When the kingdom did not come he decided to give himself up to die a vicarious death for the benefit of his people. His teachings are altogether controlled by his eschatological hopes. They furnish ad interim-ethics, fit only for the short time to

elapse before the coming of the kingdom. They are wholly impossible as general rules for human life. So Jesus is not only not a redeemer, he is not even the ethical teacher of the race. What is great in him is his ethical spirit, his love of man and truth as he saw it, and his wholeness of consecration.

It can be imagined that Schweitzer's results when published received scant approval even from the Liberals and still less from the Conservatives.

Before he had turned to Jesus as an authoritative source of our ethical life, he had already given deep study to Kant. Schweitzer had much in common with the Koenigsberg philosopher. Even as Kant saw in the categorical imperative of the moral law one of the two wonders of the universe, so did Schweitzer. And even as the former when compelled to give up the theoretical proof of the validity of faith in God, virtue and immortality, still insisted that the moral law in our bosoms demanded, postulated their existence: even so was Schweitzer's system entirely based on the ethical demands of human nature. He did, however, not follow Kant in postulating the three cardinal points of the practical reason. He believed it was unnecessary to have an exact understanding of the world and complete knowledge of its relation to man's goals and striving. Man cannot wait for that. It is his business to obey the demands of his moral nature. The will is the most important part of our nature. He who follows the urge of his heart cannot go wrong. The aspiration, he believed, present in more or less strength in every normal person, could be explained as the desire to preserve and foster life and develop it to its fullest extent.

In a man of Schweitzer's active and consecrated character such a view can be understood, but it is wholly onesided and unsatisfactory nevertheless. If in our Christian living we cannot any longer rely on the fact that God, the creator, is on our side, no longer believe in Jesus as teacher, revealer and Lord, the bottom falls out of our Christian faith.

A most inspiring page in Schweitzer's life begins when he goes to Equatorial Africa as a medical missionary. He had first taken a full course in medicine to qualify as a physician. (The book doesn't say anything as to where and how long he pursued this study). In 1913 he left for Africa, locating in Lombarene on the Ogowe river, his wife accompanying him. His self-denying work there, in erecting a hospital in the primeval forest, in the midst of savages, with their ignorance, vices and poverty; his indefatigable labor, his privations and trials; his studies in the night hours, in theology and other subjects: all these are things one must peruse in the book to get an adequate idea of the man's patience and fortitude.

In 1917 he went home tired out and ill. The war was still on and he had to wait some time before he could engage in the work of collecting money to carry on his medical mission on the Ogowe River. His music, his organ playing was the means of getting the funds. A chapter in the book is given to this subject, his Bach-interpretation, his high rank as an organist, his books even on the building of organs.

In 1924 he went back, alone, without his wife. Whether he is still there or whether he returned again to Europe, the book doesn't say. A most remarkable man, so will everybody say who has heard of him, and a most singular combination of mental and moral qualities in him; equally distinguished he was in scholarly research as in practical achievements and esthetic accomplishment.

We are grateful to the author for making accessible to us the life and labors of this great personality. The book is written with a warm-hearted admiration for the hero of the story. It is intended for the average reader even if some of the philosophical passages are not so very easy. We recommend it most cordially.

Christentum oder Religion? Eine Betrachtung über den Ursprung und die Entwicklung der Religion und die Uebernatürlichkeit des Christentums von D. theol. Arno Clemens Gaebelein. Publication Office „Our Hope," New York City. 1930.

Das Wesen der Religion hat die Denker aller Zeiten beschäftigt, aber sie sind nicht zu einer vollständig befriedigenden Lösung gekommen. Die Tatsache, daß Religion überall zu finden ist, ob nun der Kulturstand der Völker hoch oder niedrig ist, spricht dafür, daß sie zu der wesentlichen Ausstattung des Menschengeschlechts gehört. Die Evolutionsgelehrten behaupten, daß, wie auf allen andern Gebieten, so auch in der Religion eine Entwicklung vom Niederen zum Höheren stattgefunden habe. Der Mensch erhob sich allmählich aus dem Tierreich. Es entwickelte sich geistliches Leben, welches in der Folge sich nachdenklich mit der Außenwelt beschäftigte. Die erste Stufe der Religion ist die, wo der Mensch sich den Naturkräften gegenüber sah und sie auf diese oder jene Weise sich zu Freunden zu machen suchte. Der Gang der Religionsentwicklung ist vom Fetischismus und Animismus zum Polytheismus, dann zum Henotheismus und Monotheismus.

Dem gegenüber ist der Verfasser überzeugt, daß man vielmehr eine Entwicklung nach unten, eine Degeneration in religiöser Beziehung anzunehmen habe, nämlich vom ursprünglichen Monotheismus zu den niederen Formen der Anbetung.

Als Beweis dafür beruft er sich auf die Zeugnisse mancher Anthropologen und Missionare, die Spuren dafür selbst bei den niedersten Völkern gefunden haben.

Besonders auch, natürlich, auf die Bibel, welche den ersten Menschen Gotteserkenntnis und -gemeinschaft zuschreibt. Die Bibel erklärt außerdem die Tatsache der Sünde und ihre Folgen, die Verheißung der Erlösung und die Hoffnung darauf und die Bedeutung des Opferdienstes. Dieser letzte wurde bald verfälscht, aber viele Jahrhunderte später in Israel wieder hergestellt in den levitischen Ordnungen. Jedenfalls, so sagt er, halten wir fest daran, daß das Christentum nicht durch Entwicklung zustande gekommen ist. Es hat eine übernatürliche Grundlage, ist übernatürlich bezüglich der Person des Herrn und seines Werkes, bis zu seiner Wiederkunft.

In dieser Beziehung schließen wir uns dem Verfasser an, während sonst in mancher Beziehung wir die Resultate der kritischen Bibelforschung annehmen, während er denselben ganz ablehnend gegenübersteht.

„Evangelische Diaspora und Gustav Adolf-Verein." Zum Siebzig-Jahr-Geburtstag des Vorsitzenden des Gustav Adolf-Vereins (Prof. D. Dr. Franz Rendtorff), herausgegeben von D. Bruno Geißler, Generalsekretär des Zentralvorstandes. Leipzig, 1930. Verlag des Zentralvorstandes des Evang. Vereins der Gustav Adolf-Stiftung. 455 Seiten. Leinenband 10.— Reichsmark.

In die Reihe der Werke des großen kirchlichen Aktivismus wie Aeußere Mission und Innere Mission gehört auch **die evangelische Diaspora-Arbeit,** wie sie die Aufgabe des auch uns gewiß nicht unbekannten **Gustav Adolf-Vereins** ist. Es handelt sich hier um die Unterstützung evangelischer Gemeinden, die in der „Diaspora", der „Zerstreuung" unter Glaubensfremden leben und in ihrer Existenz bedrängt sind. Und zwar um recht „reale" Unterstützung; denn der Verein — zu Unrecht hat man hier und da einen Tadel aus der Betonung dieser Seite gemacht — „baut Kirchen," und das wiederum ohne Ansehn, ob lutherisch, reformiert oder uniert. Wenn nun unsre Synode mit ihrer deutsch-pietistischen Tradition im stärkst aktivistischen Land der Welt stets an der Mission gehangen hat, so hat sie ohne Zweifel auch ein besondres Interesse des durch die Liebe tätigen Glaubens an diesem dritten Wirkenszweig, der im Gustav Adolf-Verein eine historische Organisation gefunden hat.

Freilich steckt die Literatur hier noch in den Kinderschuhen. Sehr gut und empfehlenswert ist die über Fragen und Lage orientierende Zeitschrift des Gustav Adolf-Vereins **„Die evangelische Diaspora"** (herausgegeben von Rendtorff und Geißler, Leipzig, Weststr. 4. Vier Hefte jährlich. Etwa 4.— Reichsmark). Sie ist als Zeitschrift für das Diaspora-Werk ein ähnliches Organ, wie es sich in deutscher Sprache die Aeußere Mission in Warnecks „Allgemeiner Missionszeitschrift" und im „Baseler Missionsmagazin" oder die Innere Mission in ihrer „Vierteljahrsschrift" geschaffen haben. — Zeitschriften, die manchem von uns nicht unbekannt sein werden.

Ein großes umfassendes Werk aber, das „Evangelische Diaspora und Gustav Adolf-Verein" bearbeitet, gab es bisher noch nicht. Und darum ist das Erscheinen des obigen Buches so sehr zu begrüßen. Mit seinem Titel geht es über seinen Gelegenheitscharakter (Festgabe) kühn und keck hinaus. Zwar ist es nur erst noch Vorläufer. Es steht vielleicht zu erwarten, daß das **Säkular-Jubiläum von 1932** uns eine **gründliche und vollständige Darstellung der Geschichte und Arbeit des Gustav Adolf-Vereins** beschert, vielleicht aus der Feder von **Prof. Rendtorff** selbst.

Geißlers vorliegendes Sammelwerk aber bietet die **Vor-Arbeit** dazu, welche die wichtigsten Ausschachtungen vornimmt und Gerüste schlägt zum Bau. Die Hände von 30 Berufenen regen sich an ihrem Platz. Zugaben von Bild- und Kartenmaterial wären uns nicht unwillkommen gewesen, hätten aber sicherlich den Preis verteuert. Gewiß aber wäre es, zumal angesichts der bedrängenden Fülle der aufgeworfenen Fragen und Bilder, übersichtlicher gewesen, hätte man die nun bunt zusammengebundenen Artikel in **sachlicher Ordnung** gebracht, wenn auch die ganz ausgezeichneten Register diese „festliche" Unordnung der „Gelegenheitsschrift" ein wenig ausbalancieren. Nur sei mir gestattet, den Strauß zu ordnen im folgenden Hinweis.

Zunächst ist da eine Reihe von Aufsätzen, die in die **Vorgeschichte, Geschichte und Gegenwartssituation des Gustav Adolf-Vereins** einführen. Sachsen mit dem „evangelischen Zion an der Elbe" war schon früh um die Mitte des Reformationsjahrhunderts Zufluchts- und Hilfsstätte für bedrängte Glaubensgenossen (F. Blanckmeister). Mit der Konstanzer Zuchtordnung von 1531 bringt F. Hauß uns ein Stück aus der Reformationsgeschichte altprotestantischer Diaspora vor Augen. Die Aufnahme der Salzburger Glaubensflüchtlinge in Deutschland als „ein Gustav Adolf-Werk vor dem Gustav Adolf-Verein" schildert K. Hoffmann-Ulm; die evangelische Diaspora im Heiligen Römischen Reich Deutscher Nation nach dem Westfälischen Frieden Oskar Bruhns. E. Rietschel weist nach, auf Grund des reichen Aktenmaterials des Zentral-Vorstands in Leipzig, wie der Gustav Adolf-Verein die evangelische Diaspora als sein Arbeitsgebiet gefunden und behalten hat. Aus den Zeiten erster Liebe wird uns das Bild J. F. Sanders gezeichnet, des Gründers und ersten Vorsitzenden des rheinischen Hauptvereins (Niemoeller). Der Gegenwartslage des Vereins werden einige „Nüchterne Betrachtungen" gewidmet (J. Kuebel). Und der durchaus „kirchliche" Geist in seinem Werk wird aufgewiesen (P. Kalweit) wie sein Wert für den Aufbau der Kirche (E. Lessing).

Neben solcher geschichtlichen steht **die grundsätzliche Besinnung über die Diasporaarbeit.** Das heute überall brennende Problem des Verhältnisses von Staat und Kirche in den Kulturgebieten (Erziehung, Wohlfahrt usw.) greift D. Otto Dibelius mit entschlossener und praktisch geübter Hand an. Er schlägt vor, die weltanschaulich bestimmten Lebensgebiete aus dem parteipolitischen Staatsorganismus auszugliedern: die „Kulturhoheit" zwar muß der Staat behalten, der wirksamen „Kulturgewalt" aber entäußere er sich in weiser Selbstbeschränkung seiner in der Moderne drohend ansteigenden Omnipotenz. Zur Auslandsgesetzgebung bringt Kindermann-Athen Vorschläge. Ueber den Zusammenhang von Volksgefühl und Frömmigkeit spricht H. Rendtorff-Kiel; über die Bedeutung der kirchlichen Zucht und Sitte für Aufbau und Bestand der Gemeinde G. Hilbert-Leipzig. D. Bruno Geißler-Leipzig behandelt in tiefschürfender Erfassung die so wichtige „Sprachenfrage" der Diaspora. Dann die Diaspora-Arbeitsprobleme selber! Licht vom Neuen Testament her läßt Prof. Feine scheinen. Den Zusammenhang von Diasporapflege und Innerer Mission betont P. Gennrich-Königsberg. Die Wichtigkeit und Eigenart der speziellen Seelsorge in der Diaspora stellt P. Blau heraus, die volkserzieherische Bedeutung der evang. Kirche in der Diaspora mit konkretem Aufweis Th. Zoeckler in Stanislau. Den Platz der Diasporaarbeit in der Vorbildung des evang. Pastors bestimmt M. Schian-Breslau.

Ein dritter Kreis von Aufsätzen zeigt **das evangelische Diasporafeld.** Zwar ist der Charakter des Gustav Adolf-Vereins übernational-ökumenisch. Er hat von allem Anfang an die evangelischen Minderheiten auch andern Volkstum. (in der Tschechoslowakei, Italien, Frankreich, Belgien, Ungarn) gern unterstützt, wo sie seine Hilfe benötigten, und hat seine helfende Hand, genannt nach dem nichtdeutschen hochherzigen **Schwedenkönig Gustav Adolf,** weit ausgestreckt. Doch seit der unselige Versailler Vertrag die großen deutsch-evangelischen Minoritäten schuf, ist der Verein heut zumal auf diese konzentriert. Das Vordringen der evangelischen Diaspora in katholischen und der katholischen Diaspora in evangelischen Kirchengebieten zeichnet E.

Wagner-Bensheim. Um ihren Teil des Auslandsdeutschtums kümmert sich übrigens heute auch die katholische Kirche (E. Schubert). Die Diaspora-Lage der deutsch-evangelischen Gemeinden in den Welt-, Haupt- und Handelsstädten schildert aus theologisch tieferen Begründungen heraus Th. Heckel-Berlin. Zumal aber fährt der Blick gen Osten und Südosten Europas. Vom baltischen Protestantismus berichtet Gruener-Riga. Die Wegnahme der St. Jakobi-Kirche in Riga und deren Uebergabe an die Katholiken wie die Enteignung des Revaler Doms kennzeichnen eine unsichere Rechtslage. Doch hält die von der Umwertung aller Werte hart getroffene gebildete Oberschicht des evangelisch-lutherischen Pionier-Deutschtums dort oben Stand und hat an der St. Petri-Kirche in Riga ein Wahrzeichen baltischer Geschichte und ein Symbol „baltischer Sendung" gegen Rußland und Asien hin. (P. Poelchau-Riga). Ins Leningrader Prediger-Seminar führt Bischof Malmgren; nach Siebenbürgen Bischof Teutsch, nach Deutsch-Böhmen (Sudeten-Deutschtum) E. Wehrenpfennig. Die Hilfe der evangelischen Großindustrie in Polnisch-Oberschlesien schildert H. Voß-Kattowitz. Und die Frage, ob konfessionelle Gründe gegen den politischen Wiederanschluß Oesterreichs an das Deutsche Reich sprechen, erörtert und verneint Stoeckl-Wien.

Zum vierten aber — so möchte man den hier anzuschließenden Artikel herausheben um seiner Wichtigkeit willen für uns — die Frage des **Evangeliums der deutschen Reformation in angelsächsischem Gewand.** Besonders und schon allein um dieses Aufsatzes willen von Dr. Karl Schneider, der England, Australien und zumal auch Amerika (Prof. in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, O.) aus Studienaufenthalten näher kennt, scheint mir dies Buch auf das höchste wertvoll und empfehlenswert. Dieser Beitrag ist genau so anzuschlagen wie jene vorangegangenen kritischen Schriften von **H. Frick** über den deutschen und amerikanischen Reichsgottesbegriff und von **Sasse** über das amerikanische Kirchentum. **K. Schneider** charakterisiert das amerikanische Kirchentum deutsch-lutherischer Reformation in seiner Erstarrung theologischer Rückständigkeit, in seiner „Liturgisierung", in der „Anglisierung" seiner Kirchenlieder und seiner Entdeutschung. Ins Auge gefaßt ist vor allem, wie man sieht, der Hauptrepräsentant der deutschen Reformation: das Luthertum. Aber auch unsre evangelische Synode ist an bemerkenswerten Stellen mit in Betracht gezogen, doch dabei nicht von der Kritik ausgenommen, sondern in pricipio gerade eingeschlossen. Kurzum, man möchte das Buch nicht zuletzt auch um dieses Artikels willen recht vielen in die Hand wünschen. Tolle lege! Dr. Werner Petersmann.